NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCL.

MAY, 1894.

OUR WHISKEY REBELLION.

BY THE HON. B. R. TILLMAN, GOVERNOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

THE attention of the United States has for more than a year been directed to South Carolina. This State has endeavored to solve the liquor problem, a troublesome one to all governments, in a manner so novel as to be startling. So much has been published about the Dispensary law in the papers and magazines of the Union that its scope and purpose are well known, and explanations on those points are not needed in this article.

History bears out the assertion that whenever restriction or prohibition of the liquor traffic is attempted, resistance, either political or by force, is attempted. When South Carolina sought a solution of this troublesome problem, and tried to solve it by passage of the Dispensary law, the inevitable conflict with the whiskey element was expected, nor has the expectation been without fulfilment. The general conditions can easily be understood, for they would prevail in any other State were a similar law enacted there; but the struggle between the whiskey and anti-whiskey elements in South Carolina has been intensified by conditions peculiar to the State of South Carolina and which would not obtain elsewhere. I will briefly outline these local conditions, so that the cause and violence of the whiskey rebellion can be seen at a glance. Prior to 1890, under a vicious system of party

Copyright, 1894, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

politics, the control of the government of the State was in the hands of the remnants of the old slave-holding aristocracy, which had saddled upon the State a condition of affairs resembling as much as possible that prevalent before the war of 1861–65. A complete return of those conditions, the outcome of that war had rendered impossible. I led a fight inside the Democratic party, the white man's party, to free the State from the rule of these old Bourbons, who wanted the reins of government to rest entirely in the hands of themselves and those who would be subservient to their will. After a canvass of the State from one end to the other, meeting on the stump two representatives of the old order of things, I received the nomination of the Democratic party regularly and by an unexampled majority; but the old aristocratic element would not submit, and ran an independent ticket at the regular election, appealing to the negroes for votes. I was elected by an overwhelming majority, the greater part of my support coming from the agricultural classes, which had until then been practically deprived of a voice in the selection of the officers of the State government. The old Bourbon element had control of the press and the banks. Among them were the best-trained intellects of the State, and these all kept warring upon the new order of things. Taking the position that naught good could come out of Nazareth, they opposed every act of my administration, which has been for the masses as against the classes.

In 1892, after another hot canvass, I was re-elected Governor, obtaining an increased majority. The Bourbons began to see that they could never be returned to power by a vote of the people, and commenced casting about for new combinations and devices by which to regain power.

In the fall of 1892, the General Assembly passed the Dispensary Act as a compromise between the wishes of the ultra-prohibitionists and the whiskey people. This law gets rid of the worst features of the liquor traffic, while not removing liquor beyond the reach of those who desire to drink it in moderation. It was natural that the men who had been engaged in the liquor business should try to evade the law and sell liquor in violation of it. They opened "blind tigers" for the sale of contraband liquors. The Dispensary law provided for the commission of whatever number of constables was deemed necessary for the discovery and suppression of these places. The Bourbons made this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feature the point of attack upon the law; their many papers hounded down these men, calling them "spies" and "sneaks," and applying to them all manner of abusive epithets, thus seeking to stir up against them the anger of the people in the towns and cities, the inhabitants of which constitute the opposition to the reform movement which resulted in my election. Almost all the work of these constables had to be done in these cities, which made it easier to create bitter, unreasoning prejudice against them. Every daily paper in the State, save one, is under the control of the "antis," as they are called, and these have spared no effort in the attempt to stir up anger against the constables, the law under which they operate, and the administration which enacted that law. Realizing the effect of the assertion that liberty is in danger, they used that sacred name in the appeal for subversion of the Dispensary law and the retirement from authority of those who are responsible for it. The law gives the constables, when armed with proper warrants from the civil authorities, the right to search private residences for the seizure of contraband liquors. Were this provision absent from the law, it would be practically inoperative, as men would turn their private residences into "blind tigers," where they would sell liquor with impunity. The papers supporting the combination of the whiskey men and the old political leaders alleged that the Dispensary law gave the constables the right to search private residences indiscriminately and without warrant, which is something to which Anglo-Saxon blood will not submit. These falsehoods stirred up bitter, unreasoning passion in the cities and towns against the constables, and threats were freely made against them. Being in danger of bodily harm, after having been mobbed and pelted with rotten eggs on more than one occasion, the constables were armed for their own protection. Hypocritical use was made of the old adage that "A man's home is his castle," to incite violence. "A man's home is his castle," but he has no right to turn it into a saloon and expect to exercise the same rights there he would have in a private dwelling.

These were the conditions of thought and feeling existing at the time of the whiskey rebellion, which broke out last month.

The towns of Darlington, Florence, and Sumter are points of a triangle connected by railroads. Darlington and Florence are ten miles apart and both are about forty miles from Sumter.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Certain people in those towns banded together for opposition to the Dispensary law, especially the constabulary feature of it. Several constables were sent to Darlington. The leaders of the conspirators spread abroad reports that the constables were there for the purpose of searching private houses without warrants. This was not true; the constables, under the Dispensary law, could not search private residences without warrants, and they had no intention of searching any residence in Darlington—all of their warrants being for the search of public places, where contraband liquors were stored and sold. But the false report was spread and had its due effect, when the execution of the warrants began. Large numbers of armed men gathered on the streets for the protection of a "liberty" which was not in danger. The five or six constables in Darlington were followed by this armed mob which guyed, cursed, and abused them. I thereupon ordered the Chief Constable by telegraph to proceed to the scene with re-enforcements. The six constables on the ground being in danger, I sent a military company from Sumter to Darlington for their protection while in discharge of their duties as officers of the State carrying out one of its laws. The mob quieted down at once, and the military company returned home the morning following its arrival in Darlington. In the afternoon of the day of the departure of the company, four of the constables, their work being done, went to one depot and the other nineteen to the other, to depart. Two boys, citizens of Darlington, got into a fight at the depot where the main body of constables was. One of them, who was whipped, ran up town and returned, followed by an armed mob. A wrangle started a fight between this mob and the constables. One constable and two of the mob were killed, and several constables and citizens were wounded. When the mob were put to flight, the constables themselves took to the woods near by, for they knew that the flying mob would return re-enforced by hundreds of armed fellow-conspirators. Such was the outcome. The town bell was rung as a tocsin to the conspirators, and they turned out in the twinkling of an eye, all heavily armed. The constables were pursued and the conspirators in Florence and Sumter, being called out by telegraph, joined in the pursuit. Fortunately night soon came on and none of the chasing parties came up with the escaping constabulary, or else more blood would have been shed. The disposition of the conspirators to exterminate the constabulary is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shown by the fact that the train containing the four constables who had gone to the other depot of the town and had taken no part in the fight, was riddled with bullets fired in a desperate attempt to kill them as it came by on its way to Charleston.

The mob took possession of the three towns, committing many acts of violence. In Sumter, where the first mobbing of Dispensary constables took place, there is one of the best managed Dispensaries in the State, and the police authorities have assisted in the enforcement of the Dispensary law. The part this town took in the rebellion was confined to the going out of its most lawless and turbulent citizens to aid in the chase of the constables.

Under the Dispensary law, part of the profits of the Dispensaries goes to the towns in which they are located, provided the authorities of those towns assist in the enforcement of the law. In cases where municipal authorities fail to help enforce the law, the State Board of Control is vested with authority to withhold from such towns the share of the profits that would otherwise come to them on the morning when the constables were first maltreated in Darlington the municipal authorities of that town were notified that they would receive no share of the profits from the Dispensaries located in that town, because they had failed to do their duty towards the enforcement of the law. A similar notice had been given to the Council at Florence. This added to the anger of the mob, and had much to do with inciting the mob in Florence to looting the Dispensary there.

I was informed by the sheriff that the civil authorities were powerless in Darlington, and was asked to order out the militia. I did so, ordering out at first five companies nearest the scene—three at Columbia, one at Manning, and one at Sumter. The old political Bourbons, aided by the whiskey element, brought such pressure to bear upon the companies in Columbia that they refused to obey the orders of their Commander-in-Chief. The Columbia companies set the example, and it was followed by the other two companies I had ordered out. Thirteen of the town companies, and the entire fourth brigade, composed of the troops of Charleston, refused to turn out when ordered to do so. The armories of two companies in Columbia, one in Florence, and one in Chester were broken into and their guns stolen, possibly with the connivance of members of the companies. The idea was that I would be left powerless, and that similar disorder

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could be created in other cities, making it necessary for the United States Government to take charge of the State, thus accomplishing their determination to overthrow my administration and restore themselves to power by my downfall. But many military companies, without regard to politics, remained true to their allegiance, and the yeomanry of the State volunteered for duty in such numbers as showed the conspirators that they were powerless. Had I deemed it necessary, I could in forty-eight hours after issuance of the call have had an armed force of ten thousand farmers at my command. But this was not necessary; my determination to uphold the laws of the State and to protect its officers, and the fact that I would be supported by the best citizens of the State, overawed the conspirators and they subsided.

The trouble at Darlington culminated on Friday, March 30, at 4 P. M. Valuable time was lost that evening and night while waiting to mobilize the militia which failed me at the last. Orders did not go to the companies which responded until Saturday morning; the first company that could be depended on arrived in Columbia on Saturday evening at 5 P. M. As a more dangerous mob had assembled in Columbia on Friday night than was pursuing the constables at the scene of the disturbance, I deemed it wise to concentrate troops there to overawe it and not leave the capitol unprotected or move on Darlington until I had a force to do both. Saturday night and Sunday, militia and volunteer companies of farmers' continued to arrive, so that on Sunday evening I felt warranted in ordering three hundred men to Darlington and had as many more in the city of Columbia. This last force was mostly volunteers who had taken their horses from the plough, and, shouldering their shotguns, hastened to sustain the government of their choice.

One of the most potent factors in the suppression of the rebellion was the seizure of the telegraph lines and the railroads. It is hard to say how much mischief would have been done had I not availed myself of the old statute which was doubtless placed among our laws for just such an emergency. By this means excitement was allayed and the insurgents were kept from being reinforced. The people had been wrought up to a frenzy of excitement by the many blood-curdling and sensational despatches sent out before the seizure of the wires, and I feel sure that, had I not stopped

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their transmission, we would have had collisions between the excited and angry countrymen and townspeople in several parts of the State. The railroads obeyed the order and co-operated with me without protest, deserving great credit therefor, but I had to invoke the assistance of the judiciary by injunction on the telegraph company until I could use the military and seize the offices of the company by force. This caused considerable dissatisfaction among the newspapers, but under like circumstances I would do the same thing again, even without authority of a statute, for the public welfare demanded it.

A prompt reorganization of the militia has been ordered. All the men who disgraced themselves by refusing to respond to my orders will be dismissed from the service. The conspiracy is crushed and will raise its horrid head no more. The inevitable conflict with the whiskey element, which was made more fierce than is ordinarily the case by the political complications I have briefly sketched, has been fought, and the Dispensary law will hereafter be enforced more rigidly than ever.

As I stated in an address to the troops:

"The Dispensary law was enacted by the Legislature, by the majority of the representatives of the people. It is the law until the Supreme Court declares it unconstitutional or until repealed. The places to fight it are the ballot box and the courts, and not with bullets."

And until it is declared unconstitutional by the courts, or repealed by the General Assembly, it shall be enforced at all hazards.

B. R. TILLMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUCCESSFUL PUBLIC-HOUSE REFORM.

BY THE RIGHT REV. FRANCIS JOHN JAYNE, D. D., BISHOP OF CHESTER.

RIGHT reason and Scandinavian experience—these are the converging roads to belief in that method of public-house reform on which attention is now being earnestly and hopefully fixed in both America and Great Britain. Right reason, contemplating in other departments of life the achievements and adaptabilities of the civic spirit, the spirit of local patriotism, its power of conducting the business, supplying the wants, healing the wounds and grappling with the foes of society, is constrained to ask why scope should not be allowed for its beneficent operation here too, where "our need is the sorest," and where, if anywhere, the best blood is required to purify and regenerate our social system. Why, at least as an experiment, should not the peculiarly perilous alcohol monopoly be transferred from private to public hands, placed beyond the reach of private greed, cut off from its sinister connection with party politics, and disciplined to serve the community of which it has hitherto been in no small degree the tempter and tyrant. By thus socializing the public-house, its character and motive would be transformed, and abuses attacked at the root.

This is the road which other feet besides my own have travelled. Two capital instances may be mentioned. The fathers of temperance reform in Sweden, who had no previous experience to guide them, were obviously led by sheer reason and common-sense to include in the act of 1855 that pregnant clause which bore the first of its now abundant and world-famed fruits at Gothenburg in 1865. Mr. Chamberlain has also kindly enabled me to state in his own words the working of his mind some twenty years ago. In a recent letter he writes:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"You are quite correct in supposing that my Scandinavian experience did not suggest my proposals, but that my visit was made to confirm previously formed ideas. I started with the idea that the evil we had to combat was not drink, but drunkenness, and that the latter could be better prevented by proper regulations of the traffic than by proposals of absolute abolition which were not likely to be adopted, or, if adopted, would be likely to be evaded. At the same time, I had just had experience of the extraordinary capacities of municipal government for dealing with most difficult questions, and had come to the conclusion that, wherever it was possible to do so, all trades in the nature of a monopoly ought to be conducted by representatives of the community, for the benefit of the community, and not solely with regard to private profit. You will see, therefore, that I am entirely in agreement with you as to the grounds on which the proposed reform should be advocated, and, while I consider that the experience of Sweden and Norway has amply justified the experiment, I should be equally disposed to try it even if the results in those countries had been unsatisfactory; for I should have attributed its failure, not to an inherently bad principle, but to unfortunate methods of application."

Later on, in the same letter, Mr. Chamberlain makes it clear that, though he still considers municipal licensing as ideally best, he readily accepts the so-called Gothenburg System, which intrusts the liquor monopoly to voluntary associations, working under control of the local and central authorities and in the full light of public supervision, as the line of least resistance and otherwise more suitable for pioneer purposes. Upon this point there seems to be substantial agreement among those who in different countries have studied the question. The Company System treads less heavily on the conscientious scruples of total abstainers, and more easily finds room for the co-operation of the many capable and trustworthy citizens who are ready for any good work, so long as it does not involve the ordeal of a contested election. How conveniently this system meets the case of total abstainers may be seen in the following extract from a letter which the President of the Swedish Temperance Society, Dr. Sigfrid Wieselgren, was good enough to write me not long ago.

"The by-laws of the Gothenburg Company do not prevent the election of non-shareholders into its board of directors. I was voted in, although I have never been owner of a single share, and during eleven years I was one of the directors. I beg to call attention to this feature of the company system as being *ad imitandum*. The companies are thus able to make temperance reformers members of their boards without being shareholders, which, no doubt, would be repugnant to most of them. But as members of the boards, they have an excellent opportunity of doing a great deal of good work. And such a coöperation would certainly exercise a favorable influence on both the companies and the temperance reformers."

Than Dr. Wieselgren no one can speak with higher authority on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this subject. "His lifelong interest in the question," we are told by Dr. Gould, "is known the world over, and his practical efforts contributed quite as much as anything else to the success of the existing system." As Director-General of Prisons in Sweden and member of the Upper Chamber of the Diet, he looks at the matter from more than one point of view, and his strong convictions in favor of the reform have just found fresh expression in his pamphlet *More About the Gothenburg System*, which exposes the errors into which their quite superficial and hardly unbiassed study of the question have betrayed two English writers, Mr. Whyte, of the United Kingdom Alliance, and Mr. Mortimer, of the Country Brewers' Society. In a letter dated January 18, 1894, Dr. Wieselgren contrasts "their miscellaneous items, their fallacious figures, the grouping of which is more than bold, and their evidence, which is generally so insufficient" with Dr. Gould's "minute and calmly searching inquiry," which he considers "worthy of our respect and confidence."

The second road is that of Scandinavian experience, which has amply verified and illustrated the conclusions of right reason. Thus the idea is found to be no Utopian dream. It has taken shape as a broad, strong, beneficent fact, full of vitality, and of steadily widening operation. That the Gothenburg system has succeeded may be shown by reference, first, to the opinions of nations expressed in the most practical and convincing way. Aristocratic Sweden gave the lead; democratic Norway, not always in accord with the sister-kingdom, has in this case enthusiastically followed suit; Finland has done likewise; and Dr. Gould calls attention to the significant fact that "*no single community, as far as has been learned, that has once tried the system has afterwards abandoned it.*" Switzerland, after careful inquiry, has brought the principle to bear upon the manufacture and wholesale trade in the higher classes of spirits, constituting this a federal monopoly, and official reports speak favorably of the results in the way of decreased consumption, sounder quality of liquor, and substantial profit to the exchequer. At the Alcohol Congress of 1890, M. Milliet, the representative of Switzerland, is reported to have said that "the Gothenburg System is the best yet known solution of the question involved." A share of the profits is distributed among the cantons, to be used in counteracting the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evil effects of alcoholism, and it is interesting to observe what a vigilant eye the federal authority keeps on the employment of this share. It will be noticed that in Switzerland the Gothenburg principle is mainly applied to the wholesale trade in spirits, and we are thus reminded that the system, fully worked out, would bring the production as well as the distribution of alcohol under control, the wholesale trade being undertaken by the central government, while the retail trade would be intrusted to local associations. The combined experience of Scandinavia and Switzerland may, perhaps, some day and somewhere result in this completeness of application. In the mean time, "Half a loaf is better than no bread"; and if the retail trade is well under control, the wholesale trade will effectively, though indirectly, be controlled also.

Turning to England, the most thorough inquiry was that made by a Committee of the House of Lords in 1879, resulting in the recommendation "that legislative facilities should be afforded for the local adoption of the Gothenburg and Mr. Chamberlain's schemes, or of some modification of them." But the serried ranks of the trade, curiously reinforced by a section of temperance reformers, succeeded in reducing this recommendation to a dead letter. None the less those who took the lead in 1879 are still among the staunchest advocates of the reform, while the evidence to which they can now appeal is far clearer and stronger than it could be in those early days. Nor was the movement altogether checked. In the canteens and regimental institutes of our army, especially in our Indian army, under the influence of Lord Roberts, and again in four favorably situated parishes under the most laudable enterprise of two clergymen and two laymen,* what is essentially the Gothenburg System has been doing valuable service not only for those directly affected, but in support of a measure for which the country is steadily, if slowly, ripening.

From the opinions of nations we pass to the opinions of experts, and these, again, are practically unanimous in approval of the system. From America, Dr. Gould, Mr. John Graham Brooks, and Mr. Koren, Secretary of the Massachusetts Commission; from Sweden, Dr. Wieselgren; from Norway, Mr. Berner, sup-

* Viz.: Lord Wantage, the Hon. C. L. Wood, the Revs. O. Albert Mordaunt, and F. Willett.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ported by 120 opinions of leading officials, collected last year by Mr. T. M. Wilson; from Switzerland, M. Milliet; from Germany, Dr. Baer; for England, our late Ambassador at Stockholm, Sir F. R. Plunkett, whose two reports embody a multitude of contributory consular opinions, and the twenty-two Englishmen, including Mr. T. M. Wilson, of an average residence of sixteen and a half years in Norway, who memorialized Lord Rosebery in refutation of Mr. Michell's now thoroughly discredited report—here we have a bulk of testimony side by side with which the adverse opinions of Messrs. Whyte, Mortimer, and Michell look puny indeed. If space permitted, I could add a long list of those who have studied the system *in situ*, and are fully convinced that it ought to have a fair trial among ourselves. But apart from these, sum up the account, and it is no exaggeration to say that not less than ninety-five per cent. of the evidence is unequivocally favorable. Dr. Gould's conclusions, as given in his report, are doubtless so well known in America that I need not recapitulate them. In the fifth chapter he summarizes the advantages and disadvantages of the company system, and on examining these it is found that the few disadvantages do not belong to the system itself, but to the incompleteness with which it has hitherto been applied. Brandy drinking was the national habit and curse, to cope with which the Gothenburg System was originally framed. Of late years beer drinking has become an alarming source of drunkenness. The system is therefore being extended to meet the new conditions, and we learn that where powers have been taken for dealing with fermented as well as spirituous liquors, the results have been most satisfactory. One great lesson to be learned from Scandinavian experience is that control should be made as comprehensive and effective as possible, and the instrument is one which readily accommodates itself to altered circumstances and fresh requirements. In a letter dated January 10, 1894, Dr. Gould writes thus:

"The deeper I study this problem and the more I acquaint myself with the different systems which have been at work in our American commonwealths, in Canada, and in other places where Prohibition, Local Option, High License, and No License have been tried, the more firmly I am convinced that the Scandinavian system of control is by far the best and most practicable method."

Temperance reformers in England have lately been reading with much interest Mr. Fanshawe's careful and impartial report

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the American licensing systems. He leaves his readers to draw their own conclusions, but these can hardly tell in favor of prohibition, while high license comes off with more credit. Now it is surely true that in the Scandinavian system we have high license at its purest and best. An authorized company can offer the community advantages financial, social, and moral with which no one trading for private profit can hope to compete. The tender of such a company would run somewhat thus :

" We are prepared to undertake the licensed victualling of your locality, paying to the dispossessed publicans and to other legitimate claimants such compensation as law and equity may require. We will at once reduce our houses to such a number as the licensing authority may deem necessary. In Stockholm the brandy shops were reduced from 193 to 87 in a single day, without a murmur from the working-classes. We will re-engage respectable publicans as managers on terms far more favorable to themselves, their families, and the community than managers now enjoy under the tied-house system. They will receive a fixed salary with a bonus on the sale of eatables and non-alcoholic drinkables, but with absolutely no benefit from the sale of intoxicants. They will thus have no inducement to push the sale of alcohol, to drink with their customers, or to adulterate their liquor, while temperance beverages of every kind will be brought well to the front, invested with prestige, and supplied in the most convenient, attractive, and inexpensive way. Our surplus profits, after payment of a strictly limited interest, will be applied to public non-rate-aided objects, chosen from within lines laid down by statute, and including the establishment of bright and attractive temperance houses, to which those who wish to keep quite clear of the temptations of alcohol in any shape can safely resort. We should start on the distinct understanding that, if in due time we are found wanting as public servants, we must promptly make way for our betters. This is our tender. Will you accept us as your servants?"

I have outlined the good which a company can undertake to do ; the evils it will prevent are thus summarized by Dr. Wieselgren: "The Gothenburg System has proved itself a protection *against* the evil influences of individual greed of gain ; *against* the continued impoverishment of poor public-house visitors through drinking on credit or pawn tickets ; *against* the public-house visits of young people, and their enticement to drink; *against* the neglecting of the sanitary interests of the public-house customers with regard to the premises and the food which is sold there; *against* the transgressing of the restrictive regulations of the law with regard to the hours of sale, the quantities allowed to be sold and the whole management of the business; *against* a competition which lowers the prices ; *against* an unnecessarily great number of licenses being used, although granted;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the withholding of any part of the sale from taxation; and finally *against* the rise of a mighty class of private publicans who, wherever they exist, are the greatest hindrance to the success of moral or religious movements." It is hard to understand why a method of so much performance, as well as promise, should be refused a footing in any country which has the licensing problem to solve. But ignorance, prejudice, self-interest, and political complications are obstacles not to be removed in a day. Still *dabit Deus his quoque finem,* and the cause demands our staunchest efforts. Mr. Cobbett's famous saying, "The temperance cause lies at the foundation of all social and political reform" is as true now as it ever was. Our aims are not merely to reduce drunkenness with its attendant train of ills—pauperism, crime, and misery in many shapes—but, while strenuously securing this, to brighten, sweeten, and enrich the life of our people by lifting their public refreshment to an altogether higher level. In such a climate as ours, with labor shortening and leisure lengthening, this entertainment-of-the-people question must grow in significance and importance. To say, as we sometimes hear it smoothly said by brewers, publicans, their political dependents, and by the advocates of *Laissez faire,* that the true work of temperance reform cannot be done by legislation, but must devolve on religion and education, is to bewilder the public mind with the sophistry of a half-truth. Here, as elsewhere, it behooves us to clear our minds of cant. You cannot of course make men temperate by act of Parliament. But by act of Parliament you can do much to sweep away the hindrances which go far to thwart the best efforts of church and school. Those who talk so glibly of education should not forget, first, that the ubiquitous tippling-house is a consummate trainer of youth in the way it should *not* go, for vice can educate as well as virtue; and, next, that the demand for legislation is itself the outcome of those influences in which we are told to put our trust. It is just because religion and education have been fruitfully at work that the reason and conscience of a people cannot rest till law has removed the barriers shortsightedly set up by earlier law or lax administration, behind which drunkenness is protected and fostered, and till the good angels of society have thus been given a fairer field on which to do battle for the right.

The friends of temperance reform in Great Britain already owe much, and hope to owe more, to the corresponding move-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment across the Atlantic. America has facilities denied to us, and, if I am not mistaken, is free from at least one difficulty which we must frankly face. We in England approach licensing reform with clouded eyes and fettered limbs. America can think and move more freely. The steps taken by the Washington Labor Department and the Legislature of Massachusetts—to say nothing of the great task which the National Committee of Fifty has undertaken—would provoke our envy, did they not rather claim our admiring gratitude and hopeful expectation. England's peculiar difficulty is that connected with compensation. About this I need only say that those with whom it is my privilege to act have a single eye to justice—justice to the trade and justice to the community. We press for a thorough and impartial inquiry into the grounds of compensation, that we may learn the facts and equities of the case, and so be enabled to do what is neither more nor less than right to all concerned. But the question is so fenced in by foregone conclusions, trade mysteries, and political entanglements that it is no easy matter to come to close quarters with it. As regards its financial aspect, those best acquainted with the working of the Scandinivian companies are confident that anything like reasonable compensation would be well within the means of English companies out of their surplus profits.

I have dwelt on our difficulties. I must not omit one special item of encouragement. Sir Wilfrid Lawson, the undaunted champion of public-house abolition, in a lately published letter, holds out the hand of goodwill to the advocates of public-house reform. To reinforce his counsel of toleration I may quote a passage from the appeal which in November last Dr. Wieselgren, himself a veteran temperance reformer, and a son of the Swedish "Apostle of Temperance," Dean Peter Wieselgren, addressed to those uncompromising prohibitionists who look askance on what they deem half-measures.

"When, on this way of moral and religious progress, we have reached so far that the majorities of the nations know 'the things which belong unto their peace,' then the licensing systems may be succeeded by the prohibition systems. But till then we must take care not to reject any help which from a noble motive is offered to us by our allies in the struggle against this great evil. Neglecting the use of a less effective remedy can not be excused by a declaration that we are not content unless the most effective one is offered. If our fathers had acted on this principle, if the policy of these modern temperance reformers who try to depreciate the value

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of every reform which has not prohibition for its aim, had been followed by them, where should *we* have been? If any lesson is to be taken from the history of the liquor legislation of Sweden, it is that the object in view is more easily attained if it is perseveringly approached step by step than by standing still in vain attempts to bring about reforms which may be highly desirable, but are impracticable, even if this standpoint has been chosen on the top of some Nebo of enthusiasm, from which, at least in clear weather, the promised land of one's wishes appears by glimpses."

Perhaps the discipline of disappointment to which we have been so long subjected may weld into solid and well-tempered strength the detached and often mutually colliding sections of those who are of one heart, though not yet of one mind, in their zeal for temperance.

In the mean time a sound principle has nothing to lose, but everything to gain, by ventilation. Of stir and sifting and manifold enterprise on both sides of the Atlantic we can hardly have too much. To a better and more hopeful cause we may apply the old Jacobite motto, and cheerily say: "Push it about; it will come to the king."

F. J. Cestre.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NATIONAL HEALTH BUREAU.

BY THE SURGEON-GENERAL OF THE ARMY, GEORGE M. STERNBERG.

We plume ourselves upon the extent of our territory, the intelligence and enterprise of our people, and our rapid progress in all of the arts which add to the comfort and enlightenment of man; but in one particular, at least, we are lamentably behind the leading countries of Europe. We have to-day no central health bureau, and, so far as national legislation is concerned, the sanitary interests of the people have received but little attention. It is true that laws have been enacted with a view to the exclusion of exotic pestilential diseases. But even if it should be conceded that the national quarantine service, as at present administered, is efficient for this purpose—and this is not conceded by many leading sanitarians in the country—the necessity for a central health bureau would be none the less imperative.

From the point of view of sensational writers for the daily press, and, unfortunately, of many of those upon whom national legislation depends, the exclusion of cholera, yellow fever, and other exotic maladies is the prime object of national sanitary legislation; and past experience shows that it is only under the stimulus of a recent or threatened epidemic that the attention of our lawmakers can be fixed upon these important interests long enough to secure any action. And yet it is well known to health officials and to the medical profession generally that the mortality from preventible diseases which prevail in all parts of the country, such as consumption, typhoid fever, diphtheria, summer diarrhœa of children, etc., is far greater than that caused by cholera or yellow fever in countries where these diseases prevail

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

habitually. Even in Havana and in Rio de Janeiro, where yellow fever is endemic, the mortality from consumption considerably exceeds that from yellow fever. And during the recent extended prevalence of cholera in Europe the mortality from this disease has not been great compared with that from the endemic infectious diseases mentioned—tuberculosis, typhoid fever, and diphtheria.

The exclusion of exotic pestilential diseases by quarantine restrictions will be imperative until such time as our towns and cities shall have been made proof against the extension of such diseases by sanitary measures which can readily be formulated to-day, but the execution of which calls for the expenditure of large sums of money and for the enactment and honest execution of state and municipal laws founded upon the exact knowledge now in the possession of sanitarians.

The principal objects of a central health bureau should be to extend and disseminate this exact knowledge, to give advice with reference to its application to special cases; to correspond with the central health authorities of other countries, for the purpose of learning their methods of sanitary administration and the results of the same; to collect and publish vital statistics, etc. Not the least of its functions will be that last mentioned. It is only by the study of vital statistics that we can obtain precise information with reference to the principal areas of prevalence of various preventible diseases, the reasons for increased or diminished prevalence in a given area, the results obtained by sanitary improvements, etc.

If space permitted, numerous instances could be cited showing the value of such information collected by the central health authorities of European nations. Without doubt England has taken the lead in this line of investigation, and it is mainly through the information collected and disseminated by the "Registrar-General" that sanitary improvements have been stimulated and their results definitely determined. In the "decennial report" for the period ending in 1880, made by Dr. Wm. Ogle to the Registrar-General, he says:

"In 1861–70 there was on an average 22,416 deaths annually to a million persons living; in 1871–80 the proportion of deaths was only 21,272, a saving of 1,144 lives annually to each million of persons living."

A similar saving in this country would amount to over 68,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per annum. Is this a saving worthy of the attention of Congress, or must sanitary legislation still be thrust aside to give time for discussions concerning the tariff and currency? This certainly is not "a local issue," and to many intelligent citizens it seems that the health of the people is entitled to consideration equal to that accorded to economic and educational questions. This view has been repeatedly expressed in resolutions adopted by the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, and other organizations interested in sanitary matters. By some it has been urged that the importance of the interests involved calls for the creation of a "Department of the Public Health," with a cabinet minister at its head. The arguments advanced in favor of this proposition have great force, but it is doubtful whether such a measure could be carried through Congress. It therefore appears to us that the bill prepared by the Committee of the New York Academy of Medicine, which proposes "to establish a Bureau of Public Health within the Department of the Interior of the United States," should receive the support of all those who have been in favor of a department of public health, and of intelligent citizens generally. This bill provides for a Commissioner of Public Health and an Advisory Council, the Commissioner to be

"an expert sanitarian appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate. He shall preside at the meetings of the Advisory Council and shall be the responsible head and executive officer of the bureau."

We fully indorse this proposition to place a single commissioner at the head of the Bureau of Public Health. The defunct National Board of Health was weak because it consisted of several members living in various parts of the country, and who devoted their time—with the exception of the secretary—to other pursuits, except when they assembled in Washington for a regular or special meeting of the board. Moreover, this board, not being attached to either of the great departments of the Government service, had no defender in the cabinet and was subject to the attacks of enemies whose ambition it was to supplant it.

We also approve of the proposition to have the "Bureau of Public Health within the Department of the Interior of the United States." The demand for a central health bureau comes largely from the great interior States. It is here that the greatest saving of life can be effected by sanitary improvements, and it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

here that the greatest losses would occur if cholera should be introduced into the country through one of our seaports. That these great interior States shall have no voice with reference to the regulations to be enforced at seaboard cities for the exclusion of exotic pestilential diseases, which when introduced have no respect for State lines, is no more reasonable than to refuse them a voice with reference to the maintenance of a navy and of seaboard defences. They pay their share of the taxes which go to the support of the institutions for the common defence, and they are willing to pay their share of the expense of maintaining a national quarantine service.

This bill provides:

"That whenever the proper authorities of a State shall surrender to the United States the use of the buildings and disinfecting apparatus of a State quarantine station, the Commissioner of Public Health shall cause an examination thereof to be made by a competent person or persons, and if the said station, buildings, and disinfecting apparatus be found adapted to the purposes of a quarantine, and the Commissioner of Public Health approve of their use as such, the Secretary of the Treasury shall be authorized to receive them and to pay a reasonable compensation to the State for their use."

Under this provision our quarantine service, in time, may become what it should be—national and uniform. At present the interior States feel that they are at the mercy of those local authorities who control the appointment of quarantine officials and the enactment of State or municipal laws governing the quarantine establishments. The laws may be satisfactory and their administration may be placed in competent hands, but there is no guarantee that this will continue to be the case. And if the laws are defective or the administration lax at a single seaport of our extended coast-line, the dreaded invasion may occur and the germs of pestilence be widely sown in spite of the intelligent efforts made for their exclusion at other ports.

Although the desirability of a uniform and national system of quarantine administration is apparent, this cannot be effected at once, and the only way of eventually accomplishing it appears to be that proposed in the bill under consideration. But just here lies the danger that the bill may be defeated through the influence of interested parties. Those at present in charge of quarantine establishments see in this clause a threat that they may be displaced by officials of of the General Government. This, however, does not follow even if "the proper authorities of a State

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shall surrender to the United States the use of the buildings and disinfecting apparatus of a State quarantine station." The man who has shown his efficiency in the administration of the State establishment would be wanted by the Commissioner of Public Health for similar service in connection with the national quarantine station.

Another important feature in the bill is the provision for an Advisory Council to consist of one member from each State of the United States. "Such member shall be a physician of good repute and standing and shall be appointed by the Governor of the State which he is to represent in the Council." This provision is a wise one from two points of view: The Commissioner will have the advice of a select body of sanitarians from all parts of the country, each one of whom will be able to give him valuable information with reference to sanitary matters in his own State and to put him in touch with the local health authorities for the purpose of obtaining sanitary data, etc. And, on the other hand, the members of the Advisory Council will obtain valuable information from the discussions held at the annual meetings and from a personal knowledge of investigations undertaken by the Commissioner, and will disseminate this useful information upon their return to their homes among the people of their respective States.

GEORGE M. STERNBERG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LORD ROSEBERY'S ADMINISTRATION.

BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, BART., M. P.

IT IS very natural that the Editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW should desire to place before his readers some account of the present political situation in the United Kingdom, for there has not in recent times been seen one more dramatically interesting. As there is no politician who does not think himself impartial, shall I add that it naturally gave me no surprise to be asked by the Editor, as an impartial person, to supply such a picture?

The situation created by the sudden withdrawal of Mr. Gladstone had long been foreseen, but the change, when it came, occurred under circumstances which falsified all prediction made more than a few months before its date. In an article which I contributed to the *Speaker* in September, 1891, I had suggested that it would be to the interest of the Liberal party that either Lord Rosebery or Lord Spencer should be the next Prime Minister, although I admitted that, while there were certain advantages (both to the Liberal party as a whole and to the leader of the House of Commons in particular) in having the Prime Minister in the House of Lords, the premiership of a peer was not popular in the Commons or in the country. The administrative reason in favor of such a leadership must be clear to all who have held office, but it does not present itself with equal force to other politicians. That the Prime Minister in the Lords has a quiet workroom, instead of having to conduct the affairs of the party at high pressure, and that the leadership of the Lower House gains the advantage of being always able to secure time for the consultation of the opinion of his party, under the guise of taking time to consult his chief colleague, are very real advantages; but they are not so obvious to the public as is the corresponding difficulty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the Lower House is placed in a position of some indignity when it has to receive orders from "another place." All such considerations are feeble when exposed to the gusts of popular passion, and there can be no doubt that the increase and the change in the nature of the movement against the House of Lords have greatly affected the situation since I wrote upon it in 1891. Mr. Gladstone's resignation speech—the last which he has made within the walls of the House of Commons—was not calculated to render it easier for the majority to accept without hesitation and misgiving the leadership of a peer.

So strong was the outside hostility to the choice of any peer, and the outside feeling in favor of Sir William Harcourt as leader, so general the previous belief that Sir William Harcourt would at least be offered the reversion, should he be thought to desire (contrary, perhaps, to his personal interest) to assume the post, that the sudden selection of Lord Rosebery by the Queen, at the suggestion of Mr. Gladstone after consultation with his Cabinet, came as a surprise to the Liberal party in the country. Those in the House of Commons who know most of what is passing, had, since November, been aware that the sudden substitution of Lord Rosebery for Mr. Gladstone was in contemplation, but those among them who were opposed to this substitution, and who would have preferred the leadership of Sir William Harcourt, were in this difficulty: that the Liberal constituencies would have resented any movement pointing towards the selection of Sir William Harcourt by the party, as being ungenerous towards Mr. Gladstone, who was still at its head, and not admittedly about to quit the lead. Sir William Harcourt himself would also have been placed by any such public movement in the invidious position of appearing to seek, for personal reasons, to put himself at the head of the party prematurely. So general, however, was the feeling that he ought, after his great services, to have been offered the succession that, had the National Liberal Federation been the wholly independent body which it used to be before 1880, there can be no doubt that meetings would have been called throughout the country which would have pronounced in Sir William Harcourt's favor. For some years past the National Liberal Federation has had its headquarters at Parliament street, and has been in close touch with the official management of the party through the Whips. On the other hand, there can be little doubt but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that on reflection a great number of those who would have taken up this position have become satisfied that for electoral purposes the leadership of Lord Rosebery has great advantages.

The new Prime Minister undoubtedly increases the popularity of the Liberal party in Scotland, as compared with that which it could have attained under Sir William Harcourt; and there can also be little doubt but that the same selection decreases the unpopularity of the Liberal party in London. The improvement in London is not only hypothetical or relative, but absolute. Lord Rosebery is a stronger electoral leader of the Liberal party in London than would have been Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Gladstone had no personal popularity in London, and much personal unpopularity in that metropolis, and, although it may be to the discredit of London that this should be so, no one who knows London very well can have much doubt about the fact. It may not be entirely Lord Rosebery's County Council work which makes him popular in London. Lord Rosebery's popularity in London goes outside the ranks of the Liberal party. He has a considerable "music-hall" popularity, as it is contemptuously called,—the popularity with the unpolitical crowd, or the mob itself, of an owner of the Derby favorite. But whatever may be the causes of a popularity, which like all popularities has probably many causes which concur, Scotland and London must be counted as more favorable to Lord Rosebery than to any other possible leader.

The West Riding of Yorkshire and Lancashire, where there are great numbers of Liberal or of doubtful seats, are mined by the operations of the Independent Labor Party. Whatever may be the attacks made by the Socialists upon Lord Rosebery, as representing in a high degree the facts, though not the principles, of plutocracy, he is less unpopular with the Independent Labor Party and their followers than would be Sir William Harcourt, and electorally stronger with the trades unions and the working classes generally in the industrial counties. Moreover, the present leadership, although exercised in the one House by Sir William Harcourt, and in the other by Lord Rosebery, has behind its partnership another powerful force—the personality of Mr. Asquith; and this is counted on Lord Rosebery's side on account of the close alliance which at present unites these two considerable men. Mr. Asquith, as a "strong" Home Secretary, is not in all things popular with the working class; but, as the politician of the first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rank who has entered the most completely into the modern trades-union movement, his intellectual vigor assists the personality of Lord Rosebery in the industrial districts. The most popular of the younger ministers, Mr. Acland, Mr. Buxton, and Sir Edward Grey, belong to the same school; and there is an added force in the joint strength of all of them which fights upon Lord Rosebery's side. Electorally, therefore, there is much reason for the belief that, although the choice would not be the choice which under the circumstances of the moment would have suggested itself to the party as a whole, and was not the choice that until three days before it happened was expected by them, it is, nevertheless, probably the strongest electoral choice which could have been made.

Now for the other side. The movement against the House of Lords which, as has been stated, has grown fast, and has changed its nature very recently, fights strongly against Lord Rosebery, unless he will have the courage to ask the country to send him to the House of Commons in the manner which will be presently described. The Conservative party may possibly be sufficiently alive to the force of the popular movement to choose Mr. Balfour rather than Lord Salisbury as its next Prime Minister, a choice for which the universal popularity and the marvellous House of Commons tact of the former will prepare his party. If Lord Rosebery does not completely throw over his hankerings after Imperial Federation, which is rendered impossible to practical men by the resistance of several important colonies to the idea, he will have much trouble with the Irish supporters of the Liberal party. If he does not absolutely renounce his personal wishes in favor of a reformed, but a strong, and indeed a strengthened, second chamber, he will sooner or later come into conflict with all that is active in the Liberal party.

The week before the editorial invitation reached me, Lord Rosebery had been acclaimed by the whole party at a meeting of its peers and commoners; but just as your Webster, I believe, once received a serenade in a torchlight procession from delegates returned to support him, who then proceeded to vote against him to a man, so Lord Rosebery, on the day after he had been unanimously welcomed, was put in a minority in the House of Commons, and supported virtually only by the faithful janizaries, or mamelukes of the guard, by his own colleagues and by the Tory

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party. There had been difficulty in securing for him, for reasons which concerned the Bills and which shall presently be mentioned, both the Irish and the Welsh supporters of the Government; but Mr. Labouchere, who had been told by the whole press that the roof of his cave had fallen in, and who had been assured in the very debate by Mr. Chamberlain that he represented *Truth* alone at the bottom of a well, carried into the Lobby with him, against the Address to the Crown prepared by Lord Rosebery's new Government, every Irish member, every Welsh member, and the majority of the English and Scotch Liberals. The reason was plain. Mr. Gladstone's last message to the party had been one of war with the Lords, and the Queen's Speech, prepared under the auspices of the incoming "Peer-Premier" (to use the vile slang of the moment), contained no reference to the subject. The situation was an impossible one, and could but lead to a defect, which must have been foreseen by Sir William Harcourt and by all who are familiar with the impulses of the House of Commons.

Here lie the strength and the weakness of Lord Rosebery. If he will put himself at the head of the movement against the Peers, he as a Peer—as a man not only of considerable ability and power of speech, but also of great wealth and station—will be a stronger leader against the House of Lords than those who have not all these advantages. But as one proceeding on the old lines of the constitution he will be weak indeed. The choice is before him, but he is a cautious Scotchman who seldom makes up his mind too soon, and who may possibly make it up too late. As a democratic leader, with the support of the men who have been named, with less hostility on the whole aroused against him than would be excited by any other democratic leader who could be suggested, he would be the strongest who could be chosen, but as a continuer merely of Palmerstonian traditions, or of a Whig policy of making the best of existing conditions,—a Whig policy modified of course by the change of time,—he would not be sufficiently differentiated from his Conservative and Liberal Unionist rivals to be able to maintain himself in the position of a great popular force.

Let us now examine briefly,—for that portion of your readers who live to the west of the Atlantic, and who cannot be expected to occupy themselves with the details of our policy,—what are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the special difficulties of the political situation of the immediate future.

As regards the House of Lords, opinion has ripened very much of late. A quarter of a century ago I made at Birmingham Town Hall, with Mr. Chamberlain in the chair, a speech in which I suggested the possibility that a Peer might stand for the House of Commons, and so break down the House of Lords by setting a fashion which would be followed and would deprive it of the services of those able men who constitute its strength. The eldest sons of two Tory peers, and the eldest son of a great Liberal Unionist Peer, who is also the son-in-law of Lord Salisbury, have in the present session introduced bills, for removing the disabilities of Peers and allowing them to be elected to the House of Commons, such as will have my hearty support. It is understood that some of the Tory Peers' eldest sons in the House of Commons have decided that when in the course of nature they are to be "called up" they will refuse to go, and will insist on fighting for the privilege of remaining in the Commons. At the time when I made the speech to which I just alluded, I thought, and I thought till recently, that many of us among the extreme Radicals who prefer the present weak House of Lords to any new "Second Chamber" would have to spend our lives in fighting the Liberal party, resisting "abolition of the hereditary principle" or "reform of the House of Lords." All idea of "mending" of the House of Lords has died out suddenly in the last few months, and the whole Liberal party is now in favor of one of two plans—either "ending" the House of Lords, or else very sharply limiting its veto. Even the Conservatives are beginning to see that "reform of the House of Lords" and maintenance of the House of Lords in its present form are alike impossible; and they seem inclined to meet us on the limitation of the veto, but in a sense which would be fatal to the Liberal party. There is colonial precedent for the suggestion that the decision of the country at a general election ought distinctly and by Act of Parliament, instead of merely in constitutional theory, to override the resistance of the House of Lords. It would suit the Conservative party to have this principle recognized. They would drive us to a dissolution upon every important bill, and the rate of progress would indeed be slow, while the practical effect might not improbably be that the Conservative party would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

always be in power for six years at a time, while the limited power of the House of Lords would be so used that the Liberal party would never be in power for more than six months at a time, its reign being invariably cut short by a sudden dissolution on the least popular of its measures. What the Liberals here mean by a limitation of the veto is a restriction of the power of the Lords to obstruction for a single session, and this will probably be the scheme put forward next year (in 1895).

The main difficulty with regard to bills in the way of the present government is that some of us among its independent supporters are pledged to resist Irish land legislation in the present Parliament, and to vote for no Irish measures except that measure of Home Rule upon which we have already spent six months of our time. The Welshmen share this feeling, and will act on it unless their Bill for the Disestablishment of the Church in Wales is made secure. Lord Rosebery has met us as regards some of our much-wished-for labor legislation, and, caring personally as I do very deeply for the Miners' Eight Hours Bill, I feel myself brought over to the cause of the Administration, at all events for a time, by the support which they are giving to that measure—the first of those by which we expect and intend to establish proper conditions for the conduct of the industries of the country. But there is still great risk of the rejection of the second reading of the Evicted Tenants Bill, unless the Welsh can be assured that their bill will certainly be carried; and the course which the Government will be driven to take if they are able to carry their Budget, and so survive for the next six weeks, will be to pledge themselves to carry both the Evicted Tenants Bill and the Welsh Church Bill, which they can only do by causing Parliament to sit once more right through the year. Then, early in 1895, they will have to introduce a bill for the limitation of the veto of the House of Lords, which, if Lord Rosebery is as wise as we are all inclined to think him, will contain provisions for enabling peers to sit in the House of Commons. On that bill the dissolution will take place; and, while it seemed probable that Mr. Gladstone would have been defeated had he gone to the country at any time during his fourth administration, it is by no means certain that Lord Rosebery will be defeated if he goes to the country on a democratic programme to the cry of "Down with the veto of the Lords." The country, however, may not com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pletely credit the promises of the administration unless they undertake to abstain from using the peerage as a reward for party service.

The Independent Labor Party are no doubt destined to weaken the Liberal party at the moment, and to upset it in the long run. Their views are widely held in Lancashire and in great numbers of the industrial towns, and in London the younger electors (though chiefly Tory or Socialist, rather than "I. L. P.") are in few cases party Liberals, but the Independent Labor Party itself will probably not at the next election make a very serious stand against the Liberal Party if it is democratized, which I suggest is possible, not, however, that the "I. L. P." can afford even for a moment to lay aside its arms.

There is a good deal of opposition among the Liberal manufacturers and rich men to the Newcastle item—Payment of Members,—and it is both doubtful whether it can be carried in the present House of Commons and certain that the Government will not attempt it. With all our talk of progress, and in spite of our very rapid real advance on many questions, candidates still have to pay, or their supporters to pay for them, the enormous "Returning officers' Expenses," or, in other words, the official charges of parliamentary elections, which Professor Fawcett nearly succeeded in throwing on to the public before 1880. So long as we have no reform in these two respects the Independent Labor Party cannot be really strong in Parliamentary representation. So long as such reform is not seriously undertaken by the Liberals, they cannot expect to be believed or trusted by the Labor leaders. But the rank and file cannot be expected, in the majority of the constituencies unprovided with a strong Labor candidate, to abstain from voting at the bidding of their leaders whom Lord Rosebery puts before them, Abolition of the Veto, and Labor Legislation.

Such a Liberal-democratic policy will probably not last. Other influences may in the long run assert themselves. Questions of foreign affairs may spring up. War itself may come upon the Empire. But if democratic influences prevail for the moment with the present cabinet, the election of 1895 may give the Liberal party as at present constituted its last triumph, before it has in turn togive way to the rapidly changing conditions of society in this interesting and, as compared with conservative America, very advanced old country.

CHARLES W. DILKE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HELPING PEOPLE TO HELP THEMSELVES.

BY NATHAN STRAUS.

THERE are no earnings so highly taxed as those of the poor. They pay an exorbitant profit on the necessities of life, and death brings to them the double burden of sorrow and extortionate undertakers' bills. The poor man's coal costs him twice as much as that of the millionaire, and the poor man's loaf is apt to be half the weight it ought to be. He pays two prices for the milk he buys for his children, and generally gets it stale and polluted at that. The rent of his tenement commonly yields its owner about twice the rate of interest that is obtainable on fine residence property, and it is constructed with just as little regard to sanitary regulations as the law allows. Thus it happens that the line dividing the day laborer from the pauper is a very narrow one. To have the daily wage meet the daily wants is at best a struggle, and in hard times it becomes too much even for the strongest. How to lighten that struggle is one of the greatest problems of our time. I willingly respond to the request of the editor of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW to give an account of some efforts of mine to contribute to its solution.

In January, 1893, I opened a yard for the sale of coal in small quantities at the same rates as are charged by wholesalers for cargo lots. The Dock Commissioners allowed me the use of the wharf at the foot of Third street, East River, free of charge. When the Third Street yard was in good working order, I established another on the wharf at West Fifty-second Street. When I started the coal business, the retail dealers and pedlars were charging from ten to fourteen cents for a small measure—a price equivalent to from twelve to sixteen dollars a ton. I began by giving my customers twenty pounds for five cents, but afterward increased the weight to twenty-five pounds, being at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the rate of four dollars per ton of two thousand pounds. I bought my coal by the long ton of two thousand two hundred and forty pounds, but I found after making due allowance for waste, overweight in the measured baskets, and leakage generally, that a ton did not yield much over 100 baskets of twenty pounds, or eighty baskets of twenty-five pounds. In the early part of the season my coal cost me $4.87\frac{1}{2}$ per ton, and I got $5.00 per ton for it. Later, the coal cost me $4.25, and was sold at the rate of $4.00 per ton. In the one case the proceeds covered the original cost, in the other nearly so. The labor necessary for handling and accounting was left out of the calculation. My customers were, for the most part, thrifty, orderly, and self-respecting laborers and their wives and children. Almost without exception, they were averse to any scrutiny into their condition. They regarded the transaction as a purely mercantile one, from which I was supposed to derive some profit, and they were in no way conscious of any element of charity in the business. The methods employed were those of any well-regulated commercial enterprise conducted for profit, and strict orders were given that extreme consideration should be paid to customers. I was careful to put the business in charge of persons who had a genuine kindly sympathy with its objects, and who could give me that active, zealous assistance which springs from a feeling of pleasure in the discharge of congenial duties. I required no statement that my customers were needy, from pastor, priest, rabbi, or charitable organization. I wished to make them feel that instead of receiving a favor they were really conferring one. The following is a summary of the first season's business:

Number of tickets sold: 200,501 five-cent tickets, procuring 20 and 25 lbs.
18,933 ten-cent tickets, procuring 40 and 50 lbs.
7,799 fifteen-cent tickets, procuring 60 and 75 lbs.
2,933 twenty-cent tickets, procuring 80 and 100 lbs.
3,121 twenty-five-cent tickets, procuring 100 and 125 lbs.

No one who knows anything of the condition of the poor of this city can fail to be impressed with the appalling rate of mortality of their children during the hot months of the year. While in the winter months the death rate of children in New York under five years of age may be 230 out of a thousand deaths, in the summer months it will account for 700 out of the thousand. In the summer of 1893 I opened a depot where pure milk, both in its natural and sterilized form, was sold at cost. Extreme

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

care was taken to procure milk from untainted sources. The Health Board of the city placed at my disposal the services of Dr. S. K. Johnson, their veterinary surgeon. This gentleman, accompanied my secretary, Mr. A. L. Kinkead (who has general supervision of all my charities) to Orange County, New York, and examined over 500 cows. He pronounced them all free from disease ; and a contract was made with the proprietors of this dairy to forward to the depot only milk from the cows which had been examined by this veterinary surgeon. All known processes of sterilization were studied closely and compared, with a view to using the one that would yield the highest average benefit. During my visit to Europe last spring, I devoted much of the time I spent in Paris and Berlin to the subject. After long deliberation it was decided to adopt the process of pasteurization of milk, invented by Dr. R. G. Freeman, of 147 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City, and by him dedicated to the use of the public. It is a dictum of medical and chemical science that while the properties of milk are of such a character as to endow it, on one hand, with almost ideally perfect qualities for the preservation of health and for nutriment, it may, on the other hand, become a terrific energy for the propagation of disease. Milk is one of the most perfect of "culture fluids"; and the bacteria which get into it from external sources, after it is drawn, increase with the most astonishing rapidity. It was my effort to have the milk sold at my depot so drawn, handled, and transported as to reduce to a minimum the chances of pollution. The milk was delivered at the wharf in the early morning, and that sold in bottles was immediately subjected to the sterilizing process. The purchaser certainly got it in a condition of as nearly perfect purity as money could procure in New York. A modified milk was also sterilized and sold, consisting of one gallon of pure milk, one gallon of filtered water, and twelve ounces of sugar of milk. My sales for the season were 32,000 quarts of pure milk and 34,000 bottles of sterilized milk, both in pure and modified form. More than one thousand sick babies were fed on the sterilized milk during the months of June, July, August, and September. Most of them were ill with cholera infantum, and the benefit due to the improvement in their food was immediate and amazing. The ratio of deaths was very low—not over 10 per cent. at the outside. A great many families (five

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hundred a day in extreme hot weather) were supplied with pure milk. Their sick, puny children were provided with healthful food, and the mothers were enlightened as to the value of pure milk, and taught that it could be had at lower rates than are charged by careless grocers for old or diluted or skimmed milk.

The prices were uniform throughout the season:

4 cents a quart for pure milk.
1½ cents a bottle for sterilized pure milk.
1 cent a bottle (6 ounces) modified milk.
1 cent a glass for pure milk.

I consider the furnishing of pure milk the most important benevolent undertaking with which I have been connected. I hope to be able this year to run two or three depots for its sale, instead of one as last year. I shall do what I can to make some impression on the quality of the general supply, and I shall be able to furnish public institutions with all the pure milk which they require. But no single effort can do more than make a slight impression on the appalling sum of infant mortality due to the consumption of impure milk. I cannot impress too strongly on the attention of the benevolent the necessity of devoting their attention to this subject, and their money to the establishing of agencies throughout the city where cows' milk in its normal purity can be purchased by the poor.

The condition of the labor market during the winter through which we have just passed seriously complicated the ordinary problems of the philanthropist. The area of charitable effort was greatly enlarged, and superadded to it there was a new and perplexing sphere to be treated as one of temporary relief. It seems to me that sufficient pains have not been taken to keep the two apart. It may not be possible to do so with absolute strictness, but it is, for many reasons, desirable that the attempt should be made. A workingman temporarily deprived of the means of earning a living, and brought face to face with starvation for himself and his family, should not be treated as if he were a pauper. Any form of charitable organization which defines him as such, and considers his case as it would that of the veriest tramp, is merely an influence to degrade him. Just in proportion as it weakens his pride and lowers his self-respect by an indiscriminate use of its methods of investigation and its attitude of unsympathetic suspicion, does it contribute to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

process of pauperizing him. He may have exhausted his credit, stripped his house of everything he could part with, received all the help he could claim from the relief fund of his union or benefit society, but he remains one of the effective elements of the productive wealth of the country. In the most purely material sense it is desirable that he should be enabled to continue to be what he is, without cultivating habits of dependence or of being brutally reminded that society has no time to make fine distinctions between honest want and shiftless pauperism.

So far as I can judge from my own observation, the people who are most earnestly bent on doing good to their fellow-men are those who like to do it most unobtrusively, and who are most anxious to have the help come in a way which neither degrades nor offends the receiver. And here I must make bold to challenge some of the methods of our organized charities. It has not appeared to me that they are careful enough to employ only such people as have a genuine human sympathy with the objects of their bounty. There is no charity so fine, and there is none so prevalent, as that of the poor to those who are poorer. There are no almoners less likely to make mistakes than those who have known how hard it is to confess want, and have it grudgingly or superciliously relieved. It has always seemed to me that the true rule of conduct in dealing with those of our fellow-beings who need help is *to put ourselves in their place. Let the man who wants to do good ask himself how he would like to be treated if he were the man whom he is trying to help.* It is an old and familiar rule, but it seems as difficult to live up to as when it was first recognized as the foundation of all well-doing and the keystone of the whole fabric of morality.

I have insisted that my own work should not be regarded as among the charities. To preserve alike the independence of my customers and my own freedom of action, I have steadily claimed for it a place as a business enterprise. Others have entered the same field, and have retired discouraged and disappointed, because they took a different point of view. They found it intolerable that the poor people who bought their groceries or cheap coal should be utterly oblivious to the fact that they were receiving a favor. *But this is precisely the mental attitude which I think it most desirable for them to maintain.* I gave the very

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strictest orders to all in my employ to listen patiently and respectfully to every complaint made in regard to the weight and quality of the goods purchased. My contract was to deliver to all comers a certain quantity of coal, bread, tea, coffee, sugar, or flour of a certain fixed standard for five cents. If I failed in that, my customers had against me a legitimate ground of complaint, and I expected them to be perfectly free in making their dissatisfaction known, whether it was well-grounded or not.

The coalyards were reopened in November, 1893, for the winter of 1893-94. I found that the customers of the first year were anxiously awaiting the arrival of the coal. News that the carpenters were at work upon the bins spread quickly through the surrounding districts, and the people impatiently looked forward to the day that would see the yards ready for business again. There were four yards this last season: At the foot of East Third Street, at the foot of Rutgers Street, at the foot of West Fifty-second Street, and at 345 Grand Street. The trade on the first day exceeded the most sanguine expectations, and during the progress of the winter grew to amazing proportions. For weeks, the amount of coal sold daily ranged from 250 to 350 tons—from 500,000 to 700,000 pounds; and this great weight was borne away on the shoulders of the customers, of whom women and children were the great majority. Many of them trudged long distances to and from their homes to avail themselves of the opportunity to obtain the best coal at the lowest prices. The price of coal, except in the first three or four weeks, was five cents for twenty-five pounds. At the Third Street coal depot I also sold bread, tea, and coffee, giving for five cents two pounds of wheaten bread or two and one-half pounds of rye, six ounces of tea or six ounces of coffee. The small grocery store was liberally patronized during the winter, and averaged 800 to 1,000 customers per day.

Contrary to the opinion of some experts in charitable work, I hold that the harm done to the character of man or woman in being required to make a public confession of pauperism as a condition of being helped in hard times is infinitely more serious than any harm which can ensue from selling coal and groceries at cost to some people who can afford to pay a profit on them. It may be safely assumed that those who will carry away twenty-five pounds of coal on their backs because

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is cheap, have a very urgent necessity of being careful of their pennies. The battle against starvation is at all times and under all circumstances a bitter one, and I think the majority of people would prefer to be left to fight it in their own way, without advertising their necessities either to their friends or the world at large. To supply them with cheap fuel and food has been my way of trying to help the suffering poor to make their little go as far as possible in keeping the wolf from the door. When that little was exhausted and they had to claim charitable relief, their case might, properly enough, become a subject for investigation, but while they have cash to offer for what they buy, I cannot see that the fact of giving them rather more than their money's worth entitles the seller to ask for any guarantee that the purchaser is in want.

At least one large-hearted man in this community thoroughly agreed with me in this position, and came to me with an earnest desire to duplicate and expand some of my work. The fact that there was in New York no more sympathetic observer of that work than Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan was first conveyed to me by our common friend, Mr. H. Winthrop Gray. A few brief conferences with Mr. Morgan were all that was needed as a preliminary to the equipment and opening of a large central depot for coal and groceries at 345 Grand Street. The building has a frontage of 50 feet, is 75 feet deep, and consists of five stories and a basement. It was rented on Wednesday, December 27th, and was opened on the morning of Saturday, December 30th, with a cargo of coal in the cellar, 6,000 loaves of fresh bread on the shelves, and thousands of packages of tea which had been weighed and wrapped on the Thursday and Friday previous. Later, coffee, sugar and flour were added to the stock, and all the articles were sold in five cent quantities as follows:

Coal	25 pounds
Tea	6 ounces
Bread	2 loaves
Coffee	6 ounces
Sugar	1¼ pounds
Flour	3¼ pounds

The business of the store grew with amazing rapidity, as many as 24,000 five-cent tickets being sold in a day. At the date of writing this, it is still doing a very large business, but it will close on Saturday, April 14th, with the disappearance of many of the conditions which it was intended to mitigate. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

store was organized and equipped under my personal supervision, but all the expenses in connection with it were borne by Mr. Morgan, who experienced very great satisfaction with the results we were able to achieve. Complete returns of sales from the coal depots, from the Third Street grocery, and from Grand Street up to March 31st, present a somewhat imposing array of figures. Massed together they are as follows:

	Quantities.	Value.
Coal	32,716,235 pounds	$65,533
Sugar	375,150 "	15,125
Bread	370,694 "	9,278
Flour	151,508 "	2,450
Coffee	69,812 "	9,200
Tea	48,563 "	5,550
Total		$107,136

One indirect effect of these coal and grocery depots was to reduce the price of the commodities in which they dealt over a considerable part of the neighboring area. In so far as my own coal business was concerned, I had no hesitation in undertaking it from the fear of injuring any one. The large dealers in coal are mostly rich and prosperous men whom no such competition could possibly affect. To the grocery store the sale of coal is merely incidental, and the pedlars who are the chief distributors in the tenement districts, could readily find some other marketable product in which to trade. People who could afford to pay for the cartage of their coal would still buy from them, in any case; it was only the very poor who were likely to be my customers. But if we are to deal in a large way with the very important problem of the economical distribution of the necessaries of life, it will be impossible to stop to balance the interests of the few against those of the million. As a contribution to organized or individual effort in this direction the experience of my stores has a very direct value. Without going into figures, I can say that an addition of twenty-five per cent. on the price, or a deduction of twenty-five per cent. from the quantity, would about represent the difference between profit and loss on all the articles of daily use which were sold at the yards and stores above enumerated. I do not include in this the expense of fitting up, which was necessarily a disproportionately large addition to the cost of running the business, being done for a short season and a special emergency. In an established business, too, the size of the packages dealt in might be increased with a manifest saving both in the wages of the packer and the waste of material.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But even on the basis of five-cent quantities of everything, and with due allowance for annual interest on the cost of equipment, I am convinced that a decrease of twenty-five per cent. in the weight given could be made to yield a slight margin of profit.

To another branch of the work which I instituted at my own charge and solely on my own responsibility, these considerations do not apply. I refer to the lodging-house system, which grew under my hands as the pressure of the winter increased, till it attained dimensions on which I had not at all calculated when I undertook it. I was painfully impressed with the number of men out of employment who were condemned to spend the night walking the streets, and I resolved that, while this state of things continued, no man who could scrape together five cents should be deprived of a clean bed and a sufficient breakfast. In January, 1894, I fitted up a building at 54 West Fifteenth Street, for a lodging-house, and placed it in the charge of the Rev. C. H. Yatman, who consented to undertake its management. To each lodger was furnished a comfortable cot, which was provided with a leather cover, a pillow and pillow case, a pair of sheets, and a pair of warm blankets. In addition to this bed, a breakfast of as much bread as a man could eat, and as much coffee as he could drink, was given to each lodger. The price for the lodging, including breakfast, was five cents. This house accommodated 254 lodgers, and grew so rapidly in the favor of the unemployed that within a short time a second building at 108 West Eighteenth Street was engaged. It was quickly fitted up, and although it accommodated 311 men, it was soon filled, and there was left a large overflow of applicants for a night's shelter. As Mr. Yatman was willing to superintend the accommodation of more than a thousand men, another large building was engaged at 143 Bleeker Street. This building accommodated 450 men, but it did not provide sufficient accommodations for all of those who sought shelter, so a fourth lodging-house, accommodating 200 men, was opened at 101 and 103 Wooster Street. This latter place was furnished to me, free of rent, by a friend, Mr. Leon Tanenbaum, and his aid is the only contribution I have accepted, though many have been tendered, toward the expense of the various lodging-houses, which are now accommodating more than 1,200 men and women nightly. After the third lodging-house was opened, a portion of the first one, at 54 West Fifteenth Street,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was given over to women, and from 50 to 75 have been housed there every night. During the eleven weeks ending with March 31st, 52,776 men had shelter and breakfast at my lodging-houses. Of these 52,303 paid five cents each, and 473 were admitted free. For the eight weeks in which accommodations were provided for women, 3,286 claimed the benefit of them, of which 3,149 paid the five cents admission charge, and 137 were lodged free. For the breakfast of these lodgers, 4,160 pounds of coffee were consumed, and 50,304 loaves of wheaten bread. Mr. Yatman superintended and selected all the help necessary for keeping the lodging-houses in order, and attended to the preparation and serving of the breakfast for the lodgers. To his energy and zeal the success of this part of my enterprise is largely due. I have only two rules for the government of the lodging-houses—no intoxicated persons are admitted, and all disorderly persons are promptly ejected. No distinction is made because of race, creed, or color, and I find no jar arising from either the mixing of nationalities or the juxtaposition of white men and negroes. No questions are asked of any applicants for admission, and no investigation made of their character or antecedents. If there be room for them they get in on the payment of five cents, and so by no agency of mine is there any diminution of their sense of independence or self-respect. Those admitted free are strictly exceptional cases. Seven o'clock is the hour fixed for opening the doors, and within half an hour everybody is expected to be in bed. No talking is permitted after that, and every one is made to feel that it is for his own personal interest to have order strictly maintained. Tramps and professional beggars are not likely to submit to discipline like this, and it may safely be asserted that my lodgers have come mainly from the ranks of workingmen out of a job, or so reduced by hard times as to have no permanent home. My confidence in the honor and law-abiding instincts of my lodgers has been fully justified. As these lines are sent to the printer, over 60,000 men and women have enjoyed the advantages of a night's shelter and breakfast for five cents, but not once has it been necessary to call in a policeman to maintain order. The services of a detective or "bouncer" have been dispensed with. This is a record which cannot be excelled by the best hotel in the city.

That such men as I lodged at night should not be compelled

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to go hungry by day, I opened on March 9 on the first floor of the Bleecker Street lodging-house, a lunch counter at which all applicants might have a large sandwich of corned beef and bread and a bowl of coffee for two cents, or the coffee and bread without the meat for one cent. From the date of opening to April 4—26 days—32,545 persons were fed here, and there were used for their lunches 8,656 pounds of meat, 1,200 cans of condensed milk, 1,600 pounds of coffee, 1,400 pounds of sugar, and 11,000 loaves of bread. The experience here has been in no sense different from that of the other enterprises. Everybody who had two cents was made welcome, and, however great the crowd might be at certain hours of the day, there was always enough for everybody to eat. The customers were as orderly and well-behaved as those at the most pretentious lunch counter, and they went away with as little feeling of having been the recipients of charity as the men who a few blocks away paid 30 cents for a smaller ration of bread, meat, and coffee.

NATHAN STRAUS.

THIS TICKET IS GOOD FOR { LODGING AND BREAKFAST if presented before SEVEN O'CLOCK in the evening at 54 West Fifteenth Street, at 108 West Eighteenth Street, at 143 Bleecker Street, and at 103 Wooster Street.

OR IT IS GOOD FOR { SIX OUNCES OF TEA OR COFFEE, or 2 pounds of BREAD, or 25 pounds of COAL on the Pier at foot of East Third Street.

OR IT IS GOOD FOR { TWENTY-FIVE POUNDS OF COAL { On the Pier at foot of Rutgers Street. / Or on the Pier at foot of West Fifty-second street.

OR IT IS GOOD FOR { SIX OUNCES OF TEA OR COFFEE, or 2 pounds of BREAD, or 1¼ pounds of SUGAR, or 25 pounds of COAL, or 3¼ pounds of FLOUR at 345 Grand Street.

OR IT IS GOOD FOR { A LUNCH (consisting of ⅓ lb. Cornbeef, 1 lb. Bread, and a Bowl of Coffee) at 143 Bleecker Street.

This Ticket is good for one thing only.

I have laid more emphasis than may, perhaps, be deemed necessary on the fact that in all these enterprises, with the exception of the Grand Street store and the renting of the Wooster Street lodging-house, the expense was borne solely by myself. I must disclaim any personal credit on this score, for there is no lack of people in New York willing to spend their money in doing good. I could have had all the aid I wanted for the asking. But it has seemed to me that no slight part of the value of my work consists in the demonstration that it affords of the superior effectiveness of the individual initiative and superintendence, to any other way of administering benevolence. I had no com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mittee to consult before carrying out a project, and no delay was caused by waiting for their approval. I furnished the funds, selected my lieutenants, and gave my instructions. These were carried out promptly; and in a much shorter time than would have been required to discuss it, the scheme was in perfect working order. Had I stopped to take the advice of others, some of these enterprises would never have been carried out at all. The lodging-house project was, especially, the subject of the most discouraging predictions. I hold that the further the individual becomes separated from the objects of his benevolence, the less will be the moral effect of his well-doing. I have sought, as far as I could, to hold out a helping hand to my unfortunate fellow-men in a spirit of sympathy and confidence, instead of one of prying suspicion and distrust. I have tried to assist the very poor to tide over a hard time by making it easier for them to obtain the simple necessities of life. In doing so I have fondly hoped that I was diminishing the incentives to crime, as well as lessening the hatred which those who feel the pinch of poverty are apt to entertain for their more fortunate fellow-men. I am free to say that no pastime, however rare and costly, to which my tastes may incline, would have yielded me so much unalloyed pleasure as the work whose progress and results I have outlined. I put it to the wealthy, among whom I shall hardly be ranked, that there is at all times a field open for them to show by their personal efforts and influence that they have a genuine fellow-feeling for the poor. It seems to me that this cannot be more effectually done than by a well-regulated series of enterprises that, on the face of them, are profit-sharing with the wage-earners. Were this field fully occupied, the shriek of the anarchist, if heard, would not be heeded, and society would be at least one step nearer to the time when inequality of fortune shall be no more a reason for envious attack, than inequality of the gifts of nature, and when all projects of destructive levelling shall have passed into oblivion.

NATHAN STRAUS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HOPES OF FREE SILVER.

BY THE HON. R. P. BLAND, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES, OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THE word seigniorage as applied to the coinage means in the original or true sense the *toll* or *charge* exacted at the mints for the coinage of bullion into money. This toll or charge is always, as a matter of right, exercised by governments. It may be so great as to practically exclude all deposits for coinage, or may be so small as to invite the deposit of bullion for coinage. Our mint laws as to the coinage of gold bullion for private holders are exceedingly liberal. The only charge exacted for the mintage of gold is the payment on the part of the depositor of the expense of the alloy that goes into the gold coin.

The alloy of our gold and silver coins, as fixed by the Act of February 12th, 1873, and now in force, is as follows:

Sec. 13. "That the standard for both gold and silver coins of the United States shall be such that of one thousand parts by weight nine hundred shall be of pure metal and one hundred of alloy; and the alloy of the silver coins shall be of copper, and the alloy of the gold coins shall be of copper or of copper and silver; but the silver shall in no case exceed one-tenth of the whole alloy."

The act of January, 1837, which provided for the unlimited coinage of both gold and silver, fixed the mint charges in section 18 of the act as follows:

Sec. 18. "And be it further enacted, That the only subjects of charge by the mint to the depositor shall be the following: For refining when the bullion is below standard; for toughening when metals are contained in it which render it unfit for coinage; for copper used for alloy when the bullion is above standard; for silver introduced into the alloy of gold, and for separating the gold and silver when these metals exist together in the bullion; and that the rate of these charges shall be fixed from time to time, by the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury, so as not to exceed, in their judgment, the actual expense to the mint of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

materials and labor employed in each of the cases aforementioned, and that the amount received from these charges shall be accounted for, and appropriated for defraying the contingent expenses of the mint."

It will be observed that the seigniorage or mint charges for the coinage of gold and silver was very slight.

The act of February 12th, 1873, known as the Demonetization Act, prohibited the coinage of the standard silver dollar. Since that time all the silver dollars coined have been coined on government account. That is to say, the government has purchased the bullion and coined it as prescribed by law. After the demonetization statute of 1873 no standard dollars were coined until after the passage of the act of February 28th, 1878. The first section of that act provides as follows:

Sec. 1. "That there shall be coined at the several mints of the United States silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains troy of standard silver, as provided in the act of January the 18th, 1837, on which shall be the devices and superscriptions provided by said act; which coins together with all silver dollars heretofore coined by the United States, of like weight and fineness, shall be a legal tender at their nominal value, for all debts and dues public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract. And the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase, from time to time, silver bullion at the market price thereof, not less than two million dollars' worth per month, nor more than four million dollars' worth per month, and cause the same to be coined monthly as fast as so purchased into such dollars; and a sum sufficient to carry out the foregoing provisions of this act is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. And any *gain* or *seigniorage* arising from this coinage shall be accounted for and paid into the Treasury as provided for under existing laws relative to the subsidiary coinage; provided that the amount of money at any one time invested in such silver bullion, exclusive of such resulting coin, shall not exceed five million dollars. And provided further, that nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the payment in silver of certificates of deposit issued under the provisions of Section 254 of the Revised Statutes."

This act provides for the *gain* or *seigniorage* that may accrue in the purchase and coinage of the bullion. The profit or seigniorage is fixed, as is provided by law, for subsidiary coinage. This gain is the difference between the cost of the bullion in the market and the value or ratio fixed by law for its coinage. The difference therefore between the cost of the bullion and the amount of dollars the bullion will coin at the mints is denominated the seigniorage.

The act of July 14th, 1890, commonly called the Sherman law, provides in section three as follows:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sec. 3. "The Secretary of the Treasury shall each month coin two million ounces of the silver bullion, purchased under the provisions of this act, into standard silver dollars until the first day of July, eighteen hundred and ninety-one, and after that time he shall coin the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act, as much as may be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes herein provided for, and any *gain* or *seigniorage* arising from such coinage shall be accounted for and paid into the Treasury."

This law contained the same provisions substantially as regards the gain or seigniorage as is found in the act of 1878 before quoted. According to the last annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury, there is now in the Treasury 140,699,760 fine ounces of silver bullion purchased under the Sherman act. The cost of this bullion was $126,758,218. This bullion will coin 181,914,899 silver dollars. The difference between the cost of the bullion and the amount of dollars it will coin is $55,156,681. This is the gain or seigniorage that was proposed to be coined by the Seigniorage bill and to be used in the payment of the public expenditures. The first section of the bill provides substantially that the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be coined as fast as possible the silver bullion purchased in pursuance of the act of July 14th, 1890, to the amount of the gain or seigniorage of such bullion; to wit, the sum of $55,156,681, and to use such coin or the silver certificates issued thereon in the payment of public expenditures.

The second section provides that after the coinage of the seigniorage the remainder of the bullion shall be coined, and the coin held in the Treasury for the redemption of the Treasury notes issued in the purchase of the bullion; that the act should not be construed to change existing law as to the legal-tender character or mode of redemption of the Treasury notes. The act does not take from the Secretary of the Treasury his power to redeem the notes in gold at his discretion, but it does provide that the notes shall not be reissued, but shall be cancelled and destroyed as fast as the bullion shall be coined into a redemption fund; that is when there should be a sufficient amount of standard silver dollars coined from the bullion to take the place of the notes in the currency, the notes from time to time should be destroyed in amounts equal to the coin held in the Treasury for their redemption and silver certificates should be issued on such coin.

The contention that there is no seigniorage to be coined does

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not hold good in the face of the law to the contrary. The Sherman law before referred to, in section three, dedicates the bullion purchased to the redemption of the notes issued in the purchase of the bullion by the *coinage* of the bullion for that purpose. It is true that the bullion is set apart to redeem the notes, but this redemption is to be had by the coinage of the bullion into standard silver dollars. The bullion is to be coined, and the standard dollars coined from it is the redemption fund set apart. The gain or seigniorage arising from the coinage is to be paid into the Treasury. Nothing can be plainer than this law. The Seigniorage bill provides for the coining of this gain. This gain is well known, and can be determined as well before the coinage as afterwards; in fact the Secretary of the Treasury in his last annual report states precisely what this gain is; to wit, the sum of $55,156,681.

The fact that silver bullion has fallen in the markets since the passage of the Sherman law has nothing to do with the question. At the time of the passage of the Sherman law the amount of bullion in the silver dollar was worth in the markets, as bullion, at the gold valuation, only about 72 cents. But the law of the Senator, whose name it bears, provided this bullion should be coined into such dollars and held for the redemption of the notes. It does not lie in his mouth to declaim against his own enactments. The Sherman bill required this bullion to be coined into the standard silver dollar, and the coin to be used for the redemption of the notes, and any gain or seigniorage to be paid into the Treasury. This bullion was purchased to be coined, not to be hoarded as bullion. As bullion it cannot be used for any purpose whatever. No one proposes to sell it as bullion. This would be in bad faith. All the friends of silver contend for is, obedience to the law. The Seigniorage bill compels the execution of the Sherman law. The state of the Treasury at this time justifies the coinage of the Seigniorage first, and the use of the money in the payment of public expenditures. This is a lawful and feasible mode of providing revenue. It is not lawful, nor is it good public policy, for the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds for the ostensible purpose of maintaining specie payment as provided for in the resumption act of 1875, and after thus obtaining the money for such an alleged purpose illegally use it for another.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The veto of the Seigniorage bill, for the reasons stated in the President's message—that is to say, that no further silver coinage is practicable, unless the coinage is safeguarded by an issue of bonds to procure gold to put behind the silver dollar—makes the issue plain and direct between the advocates of the single gold standard and the friends of bimetallism. No such thing as bimetallism exists where one metal is made the sole standard.

The standard of money, or the money of ultimate redemption, must rest on both metals, or there is no meaning to the word bimetallism. Yet bimetallism does not mean two standards, but rather an alternative standard. Indeed its logical analysis is that the standard rests upon the combined mass of both gold and silver money. The President's veto, however, states the condition of the gold standard, which tacitly admits there is not sufficiency of gold to go round, or to supply the needs of the currency, either in the coin itself or the paper representative issued thereon, dollar for dollar. To make tolerable the gold standard, there must be a very large over-issue of paper money, which, to keep the parity, must be redeemed in gold. But there can be no increase of this representative money without a corresponding increase of the gold reserve, which requires increased bonded debt. This bonded debt must necessarily increase from time to time, in order to supply the demand for gold by the holders of the credit notes, as well as to secure any further increase of the circulating medium. Any one at a glance must see that here is an endless chain of gold drainage from the Treasury, and the resulting effect more bond issues. Bonded debt can thus be piled on the taxpayers without any limit. Such a system is preposterous and ought not to be tolerated. Nor can the answer be made to this fatal objection by relegating the currency issue to national banks, for at last the government is responsible for the gold to redeem the bank notes. The ultimate redemption of the bank note is fixed as a burden upon the bonds deposited for the security of the noteholders. This bond is a government bond. The government must redeem it and thus pay the noteholders. The following excerpt from the Washington *Evening Star*, of March 20th, is significant of the power sought to be exercised by the owners of gold in controlling legislation on the financial question :

NEW YORK, March 20.—A meeting of bankers has been called for to-morrow to protest against the signing of the Seigniorage bill. Bankers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

claim that when they subscribed for the bonds it was stated that there would be no inflation legislation.

A meeting of the subscribers to the new United States five per cent. loan will be held to-morrow at the Union Trust Company for the purpose of preparing a memorial to the President against his signing the Seigniorage bill. The call for the meeting is signed by George G. Williams, President of the Chemical National Bank; John A. Stewart, President of the United States Trust Company; and Edward King, President of the Union Trust Company.

At the special meeting of the Chamber of Commerce held to-day to protest against the Bland Seigniorage bill, now in the hands of the President, it was decided to send a committee of fifteen to Washington to personally protest against the President affixing his signature to the bill. They will carry with them an address prepared by the Executive Committee and adopted by the chamber.

Charles Stewart Smith called the chamber to order at 12:30 to-day. There was a full attendance of members.

Henry Hentz, Chairman of the Executive Committee, read the address that is to be presented to the President. Brayton Ives said the President must be urged to veto the bill. If he did not do so it would be a violation of a stipulation made between the Administration and the bankers of New York. Mr. Ives also said that if the bill became law it would cause an immediate withdrawal of gold from the Treasury.

Cornelius N. Bliss moved the adoption of the report, which was carried.

The Committee appointed to go to Washington are: A. E. Orr, Brayton Ives, Henry W. Cannon, Morris K. Jessup, George Wilson, Louis Windmüller, Edward O. Leech, Hugh N. Camp, Charles Stewart Smith, John Crosby Brown, W. W. Sherman, J. Edward Simmons, Solon B. Humphreys, and Henry Hentz.

A telegram was sent to the President asking an audience and stating that a committee would wait on him to-morrow morning.

The plain meaning of all this is that the people's money, under the operation of the gold standard, is wholly at the mercy of the few who by their great wealth are enabled to own and control the scanty gold supply. They practically dictate terms to the people on the money question. No financial legislation can be possible without first consulting the wishes of this great and powerful interest in Lombard and Wall streets. If their demands are refused and legislation is enacted over their protest, dire consequences must follow, for they have it in their power to loot the Treasury of its gold at any time and compel bond issues to replenish it. This operation can be carried on *ad infinitum*.

It is here pointed out that notwithstanding the Treasury needs money to pay the ordinary expenses of the government, and notwithstanding the government has assets of its own dedicated by law to the coinage, yet without the consent of the great and powerful owners of gold the Treasury assets cannot be used

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the payment of government demands. What a pitiable confession—Lombard and Wall streets are the complete masters of the people! The government is wholly paralyzed, as it stands in financial awe and dread of these gold gamblers. This state of things is simply scandalous. A silver standard or any other system that would free the people from such abject slavery would be preferable.

The free coinage of silver and gold, with notes issued on the coins, dollar for dollar, would relieve all this strain on the Treasury. Indeed, the Treasury would simply be the custodian of the deposited coin, and would have no other burden than to keep the coin in safe vaults, to be paid out when demanded and to receive back the coin again and issue coin notes against the coin.

This system would occasion no bond issues; no doubt of the ability of the government to return the coin the citizen had deposited for a government note. The expense to the government this system would involve would be more than compensated by the loss and destruction of the notes issued, the coin on which the notes were issued remaining the property of the government.

In the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for April, 1893, the writer hereof made the following statement:

"It would be well for the Democratic party, and for the country, could the questions of taxation and reduction of pensions, as well as a reduction of expenditures all along the line, be settled before entering the bitter struggle over the money question. The money question must, however, be met some time. When it is forced as the issue it may develop a necessity for a reorganization of political parties. The battle of the standard is the coming battle the world over, when it is pushed to the front for final settlement—the question as to whether silver shall be placed at its old status as the equal, if not the superior, of gold in our financial system, or totally demonetized. It will be a battle-royal.

"The time is not to be long deferred when this battle of the standards will be fought to a finish. On the one side will be arrayed the rich and powerful banks of the Old World and of the New; on the other, the mass of our people, especially those west of the Alleghany Mountains, loaded down as they are with debts and mortgages, with a vast country yet to be touched by the hand of industry and enterprise, demanding money without limit, except as to its supply from nature.

"The money question when brought forward for final solution must of necessity involve the question of the standard; whether it shall be a standard resting upon both metals, gold and silver, or the single gold standard. Compromises and makeshifts have heretofore only checked the fighting. When pressed forward, as it seems may be done ahead of tariff, and all other reforms, by the Democratic party, the peril of defeat for tariff reductions, pension reforms, and other reforms in our expenditures is great. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may be that those who wish to postpone and defeat tariff reform are more than willing to press other great measures ahead of it. The Democratic party will make a great mistake if such should be the policy adopted."

The unfortunate condition in which the Democratic party was placed at the meeting of Congress in extra session, in August last, called as it was for the sole purpose of repealing the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act, resulted in an open rupture between the friends of silver and the Administration. That breach might have been, at least, partially closed by the signing of the Seigniorage bill by the President, but his veto of that measure has widened the difference between the Executive and the Democrats of the West and South. It has caused a feeling of resentment that will probably culminate in hostile resolutions in all Western and Southern platforms on the currency question and practical reorganization of the Democracy in those sections, in emphatic antagonism to the Administration.

In the event of the disruption of the Democratic party, the Republican party will find itself arrayed in hostile camps, resulting in the final overthrow of this organization. Indeed the seeds of unrest and discontent among the rank and file of the Republican party are plainly visible. It is very doubtful, even with the vantage ground the leaders now have, if they can hold their followers in the South and West. The silver question will, in the coming elections, be vastly paramount to all other issues. On this issue the Republican party has no right, from its record, to claim the support or sympathy of the free-coinage people of the country. The result of the elections next fall cannot with any degree of certainty be forecast. Unless there is a radical change from present political conditions, the Presidential contest in 1896 will bring the silver issue to a final settlement. The outlook now portends a united Democracy of the West and South on a platform for *freer trade and free coinage of both metals.* The body of the rank and file of the Democracy of the East will go with the party on this platform and leave the Tory leaders to finish what may be at that time left of the job they now have on hand—of cutting each other's throats.

Against this reorganized and popular Democracy will be arrayed the Republican party, around whose banner will rally the Tories of gold monometallism and the plutocracy of the tariff barons. It will be a battle-royal for freedom. The power of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cohorts of gold monopoly, tariff and consequent *trusts*, as well as plutocracy in all its forms, will be challenged to mortal combat by the outraged commonalty of this country. The discontent throughout the world, consequent upon the restriction of the standard of money, is fast concentrating and massing the people for a fight that will make the closing years of the nineteenth century momentous in history. This condition is apparent in all gold-standard countries. These results were predicted by the opponents of gold monometallism from the beginning of the anti-silver crusade in 1872–1873. The action of England in suspending the free coinage of silver in India last summer, done, doubtless, for the purpose of aiding the overthrow of silver here, thus securing the unconditional repeal of the Sherman act, and the recent veto of the Seigniorage bill, has brought our people face to face with the alternative of submitting to the dictation of a few people who control the gold of the world, and who are determined, by means of the single gold standard, to dictate and control the financial affairs of the people, or of making war uncompromisingly against the inevitable degradation and slavery such arrogance of power implies.

R. P. BLAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOSTILITY TO ROMAN CATHOLICS.

BY GEORGE PARSONS LATHROP, LL. D., AND THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM CROSWELL DOANE, BISHOP OF ALBANY.

MR. LATHROP:

THE Hon. Thomas M. Waller, ex-Governor of Connecticut, tells me that some thirty or forty years ago, when the Catholics of New London were but a handful, a violent windstorm one night blew the cross on their tiny church half-way around, so that in the morning it was seen standing oblique. At once a rumor spread through the town that this was the signal for a "rising" of Catholics. No one knew what they were to "rise" for; but a panic notion prevailed that they somehow intended to overpower their non-Catholic fellow-citizens, who *outnumbered* them about a hundred to one.

This notion and the puny fear indulged by the majority were unworthy of Americans, who ought to be not only patriotic, but also intelligent, reasonable, and brave. Yet precisely the same weak and foolish alarm to-day actuates those who are loudest in claiming to be "Americans," but tremble with dread of being overcome by some ten million of their fellow-citizens, to whom they inferentially deny the national name. The cause of their alarm and of the virulent hostility shown by them toward Catholics is the same as in the case just cited; namely, wind. Only, now, it is the wind of their own breath that blows the cross into some strange position, whereat they fall into spasms of terror, like children who play at frightening themselves.

One of the organizations which have taken part in this ghost-dance, supposed to be prophetic of imaginary "risings," is the American Mechanics. They profess that there is nothing in their constitution opposed to Catholics; but, being a secret

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

society, they do not disclose what there is behind or above their constitution. It is certain that Catholics are rarely, if ever, admitted to their rolls; and that they have thrown their votes against candidates for public office, not because of unfitness, but simply because these candidates were Catholics. Lately they have taken to attending services, uniformed and with sword and banner, in Protestant churches—always those whose ministers are acrid toward Rome and throw out mysterious warnings against dangers of foreign domination. Many of their members are but recently naturalized, yet all assume to be superlatively American. They have been active in presenting national flags to public schools, a thing excellent in itself; but they have accompanied it with speeches at times grossly insulting and threatening toward Catholics. Indeed they seem to trail "Old Glory" in the dust, according to the Donnybrook coat-tail manner, with an invitation to us to step on it; so that they may prove—with fist or sword, with ballot or bullet (a word they are fond of)—how much they love it. This invitation has been politely but firmly unheeded; because no Catholic American will be a party to such degradation of the national ensign.

Another more pretentious affair is that secret, oath-bound clan, the American Protective Association—now generally known as "the A. P. A."—which, though working darkly, yet through the declared newspaper organs established by it (eighty in number), and its public speakers, has urged the political and commercial proscription of Catholics, and has hinted a cordial willingness to use deadly weapons against them. Although professing intense Americanism, it is known to have been prompted largely by Canadian Orangemen and to be in close sympathy with Orange lodges; thus importing into our national life a feud pertaining wholly to a foreign princedom. It has spread reports widely that arms are being secretly gathered in Catholic churches; apparently suffering from a Chinese confusion of the letters "r" and "l." *Alms* are collected in Catholic churches, but not *arms*. In every case where this insane or malicious charge was made specifically, its falsity has been exposed by an open inspection of the premises; for a little sacrifice of dignity was better than to allow these maligners to imperil the public peace and mutual confidence among citizens. On the other hand, a recent lawsuit to recover a balance on an unpaid bill for rifles

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disclosed that the A. P. A.s of Toledo, Ohio, have themselves been purchasing firearms and forming thus a secret military troop, against the laws of the land! The A. P. A. oath binds members never to employ a Roman Catholic in any capacity if they can get a Protestant's service; to help "retard and break down the power of the Pope"; to oppose Roman Catholics for "any office in the gift of the American people"; and to "endeavor at all times to place the political positions of this government in the hands of Protestants." This oath is a self-confessed act of treason against the Republic, since it aims at disposing of offices "in the gift of the people" by a secret and lawless body of conspirators, who are but a small fraction of the people. The A. P. A. also sends out sonorous remonstrance against any "union of church and state." Yet its oath has in view the achievement of such union, for it proposes to place the government solely in the hands of Protestants; and Protestants, with all their subdivisions, constantly refer to themselves as "the church." Moreover, the general secretary of the A. P. A., Mr. Charles T. Beatty,* assures the public that the order "is composed of men who occupy high positions not only in commercial and professional life, but *also in State and Church.*"

The A. P. A. has gained some influence in Iowa, Wisconsin; in Detroit, Mich.; in Columbus and Toledo. O.; in Kansas City, Mo., and various other places. It has circulated, broadcast, bogus "encyclicals" attributed to the Pope, or instructions fraudulently signed with the names of Cardinal Gibbons and other prelates, ordering the Catholics of the United States to exterminate non-Catholics at a specified time last autumn. It has driven a good many Catholics out of office, elective or appointive, and effected the discharge of numerous Catholic employees, thus lessening or depriving them of their means of livelihood—a course which has led to retaliation by Catholics, in refusing to give their custom to business men known to be A. P. A.s. It has encouraged and paid anti-Catholic lecturers—chiefly fraudulent or dissolute and unfrocked "ex-priests" or "escaped nuns"—to travel the country and pour forth a flood of false, obscene, incendiary abuse upon this great body of our sincere, pure-minded men and women and their devoted spiritual guides and pastors.

* See his statement in *The Independent*, Jan. 18, 1894.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Would such a procedure, if directed against Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, or Episcopalians be tolerated for a month or a week by the public opinion of Protestants? Certainly it would not be tolerated by either the public or the private opinion of Catholics, if any one ventured so to assault their Protestant brothers and companions in citizenship. Why, then, has there been no general and decisive reproof by our non-Catholic neighbors of this indecent and un-American campaign against Catholics?

The A. P. A. has already contrived to bring about several riots, with the result of killing a number of persons. Some weeks ago, one of its lecturers, a J. V. McNamara, entered a hall in Kansas City where he was to lecture, carrying a loaded Winchester rifle, and called for twelve stout Protestants to gather round him as a bodyguard. He then proceeded to utter foul slanders against a venerable and saintly nun. But the Catholics who heard him, although intensely indignant, denied him the coveted opportunity of firing his rifle and bringing on a fight. They had him arrested for his defamatory speech, and the authorities jailed him for carrying weapons unlawfully and inciting to riot. Again, in Columbus, Ohio, this "patriotic" society raised a clamor against a local convent there; threatened to break into the house; a thing which it had about as much right to do as it would have to forcibly invade a Congregational minister's dwelling or an Episcopal old ladies' home. The Church authorities, acting in the interest of the public peace, thereupon opened the doors to a committee of citizens and officials, who went through the convent and ascertained that there were no dungeons or tortures or other of the alleged iniquities there.

From whom has the country most to fear—from Catholics who, as lay folk or religious devotees, mind their own business, abide by the laws, and make every effort to preserve the peace; or from these singular "protectors," who treat one-sixth of the nation as though they were aliens, foment mutual suspicion and bitterness, threaten religious liberty, break the laws, and stir up armed strife? A few public men, unprejudiced and patriotic non-Catholics, have denounced this incendiary movement with vigor. Many fair-minded Protestant ministers, with clear moral sight, have scored it as cowardly, as opposed to the American idea, and un-Christian. But by far the greater number have remained

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

silent, and so has the majority of the daily press; thus indicating tacit approval of a religious proscription which, were it attempted against any Protestant denomination, would arouse a din of remonstrance from every leading journal. Even the Rev. Washington Gladden, though loyally outspoken in condemning the A. P. A., is uneasy at "the attitude of some of the Roman Catholic leaders toward the public schools, and their attempts, in cities where they have the power, to use the municipal machinery for their own purposes."* Would he not feel justified in taking part in politics, with his own co-religionists, for good objects; just as the (Protestant) Evangelical Temperance organization publicly declares that "the Church" has a right "to engage in politics and government for moral and legislative ends"? Why should not Catholics enjoy equal freedom, as citizens, to hold opinions on morals or education, to engage in politics or government, to advance them? The Protestant religious press, further, largely abets the unpatriotic aim of the secret societies by making such wholly untrue utterances as these:

"[Mgr. Satolli] is clothed with papal powers in civil matters. . . His definite mission is to manipulate our political affairs until all branches of government are under control."—*The Christian at Work* (Methodist).

"No foe have we so much to fear as the Church of Rome. *She is the grand enemy of the Republic.*"—*The Christian Inquirer* (Baptist).

This kind of cry has also been taken up by another association, the League for the Protection of American Institutions, which is composed chiefly of very respectable men, some of whom have great wealth and influence. The mere conception of such a league is preposterous. Why, the whole American people are a "league for the protection of American institutions"! Can it be possible that we are reduced to the necessity of handing over the protection of our government and of our public affairs generally to a self-appointed society, however respectable? This League—the L. P. A. I.—is really a more discouraging sign of the times, and more dangerous to the welfare of the Republic, than secret alliances of the ignorant and the stupidly malicious, like the A. P. A. and its congeners; because it embraces so many of the intelligent, who have allowed themselves to be deluded by false catch-words. Its object, as proclaimed, is to secure an

* "The Anti-Catholic Crusade," *The Century Magazine*, March, 1894. There seems to be some confusion of ideas in calling the attack of a secret society upon upholders of the Cross a "crusade."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amendment to the constitution of every State, and to the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting the use of public property, credit, or money raised by tax, for aiding any institution which is wholly or in part under *sectarian or ecclesiastical control.* This is precisely what the Evangelical Alliance has, for years, attempted to achieve; and the corresponding secretary of that body now appears as the general secretary of this League. The real purpose is to prevent, permanently, any possible appropriation toward the support of Catholic parochial schools; as may be seen by its published documents, which refer to "a single religious denomination" which has "been assaulting the public-school system." Catholics have not assaulted that system, but they are the only religious body accused of doing so; hence the meaning is plain. One of the gentlest members of the L. P. A. I., a personal friend of mine, while expressing to me an earnest desire for a real "Christian union" of all Catholics and Protestants, told me that if he could have his way he would destroy every convent in the country! *Ab uno disce omnes.* The L. P. A. I. (consisting of Protestants) would join with us in sweetest harmony if we would abandon the religious education of parochial schools and incidentally destroy our convents and forsake the faith transmitted to us from Christ and the Apostles.

The L. P. A. I. says (Doc. No. 1):

"We want no *foreign schools*, with doctrines, ideas, and methods *at variance with our constitutional principles*, . . . and controlled by those who seek, *by perverting the infant mind of America*, to use the American suffrage *for the overthrow of American institutions* [!!]."

It also intimates that any sharing of school funds (for maintaining liberty of conscience) would come under the head of "acts of *licentiousness* or practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the state," mentioned by the constitution of New York, or of "*crime* . . . sanctioned by any partisan sect which may designate it as religion." And it demands that elementary schools be *freed* from "denominational control." This is nothing less than an attack on the very existence of schools in which religion is taught, whether supported by individuals or the state. The L. P. A. I. further says (Doc. No. 19):

"We are not looking to monarchies for instruction concerning the best training of youth to fit them for citizenship in this republic. . . . Shall the common schools be disintegrated and destroyed by the dispersion and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

use of their funds for sectarian ends? . . . Are our citizens in favor of the union of church and state? . . . These questions must be permanently settled for weal or woe."

I sincerely hope they will not be settled for "woe"; although what the A. P. A. and the L. P. A. I. seem to yearn for is precisely woe and uproar and a general shindy among citizens. The two bodies have several points in common. Both assume to regard Catholics as enemies of popular free education and as disloyal, or incapable of loyalty, to the United States. Now, these ideas are radically mistaken: they are without basis in either principle or fact, in the teachings of the Church, or the practice of her faithful children. Those wilful or misguided detractors who insist to the contrary blot out from memory such Catholic patriots as General Sheridan and that great Chief Justice of the United States, Roger Taney, who were eminent types of thousands of humbler citizens and soldiers who share their religion. In their general hatred of our doctrine, or their suspicion and dislike of one and another among the various race-stocks represented in the universal Church, they seem to forget that it includes a large number of people whose families have been settled in this country from the earliest colonial times, who are quite as well qualified to pronounce upon patriotism as any one else. To give an instance, my American ancestry runs back through a line of Yankee blood for 260 years, and numbers a long list of Puritans who were among the active and efficient founders of Massachusetts and Connecticut, as ministers, lawyers, governors, business men, farmers, builders. Honoring their good citizenship and their piety (according to their light), and with a love of broadening popular liberty inborn, I think I know what it is to be an American and to feel as an American. For one, then, I unhesitatingly declare that Catholic Christian faith and teaching deepen and strengthen even a long-inherited loyalty to my country; and that they must inevitably intensify the sentiment and principle of patriotism in all who accept them.

But such assurance does not rest on any one man's word. The Church, teaching us that all life, thought, and action depend on God and must be obedient to him, also incessantly impresses upon us the rule that we must obey the state, the constituted human government, as representing in so far the divine law. "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the things that are God's." The Church's commands are based on that commandment of Christ, in which there is no abnormal division or conflict of loyal duties, but simply a coördination of them. Neither is the loyalty of Catholics divided. They obey God and the Church in faith and morals, and the state in other matters.

"It is the duty of all, for conscience' sake, to obey the civil law and state authorities. . . . We are bound to obey the laws of the state when they are not contrary to the law of God. Should the law be unjust or in contempt of religion, we are not bound to obey it. . . . The motive of obedience should be, not merely fear of penalties, but *a conscientious sense of duty.*" *

Could there be anything more in accord with the American idea? Our nation is founded on obedience to just laws, with liberty to resist unjust ones. Catholics everywhere have the same right of self-government and of opposing tyranny which the founders of the Republic upheld—no more and no less. De Harbe, in his approved catechism, says we are bound to assist our temporal rulers

"in their necessities and dangers, and even to sacrifice our property and life for their defence against the enemies of our country;"

and that we SIN AGAINST THEM

"by *any sort of treason, or conspiracy against our government and country.*"

The Church counsels always moderation and peaceable, loyal methods in opposing unjust laws; yet St. Thomas Aquinas, whose teachings are ratified by it, held that *unjust taxation* is a sufficient cause for revolution by the people—the precise maxim on which our American revolution was based. Four centuries before our Puritan fathers landed here he also asserted that, for good government in any city or state, it is essential that "all should have a share in the government, for by this means peace is preserved and the constitution is loved and observed by all." The Church (as attested by the Protestant historian Guizot) has encouraged and coöperated with free popular government in many towns and states, since even before the eleventh century. The Papacy neither exerts nor claims any power to dictate the political action of Catholics, here or elsewhere. If religion itself or the political rights of Catholics be threatened, the Pope may

* *The Catholic Doctrine of Faith and Morals.* By Very Rev. William Byrne, D. D. With the sanction of His Eminence the Cardinal and other Church Authorities. Boston, 1892.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advise defensive action, either by abstention from voting or by the formation of a party; but even then it is open to individual Catholics to follow that advice or not. They are very loth to take such steps, and are driven to them only by anti-religious or tyrannical secular powers. For Catholics are especially jealous and proud of their individual freedom as citizens, and do not like to limit their political independence even for the sake of protecting their faith. Their enemies sometimes force them into such limits, as a matter of self-preservation. But there is no power anywhere in the church that can compel the vote or action of a single Catholic against the secular government to which he has given allegiance, or against his conscience as a citizen. Leo XIII., denying indignantly, of late, the accusation that he had incited or aided revolt in Sicily against that Italian government which is so hostile to him, declared that "The man who does not love his fatherland is unworthy of the blessing of God." The Church has not, and from its nature cannot have, a fixed political policy; its one object being to maintain Christian principle, morals, enlightenment, and spiritual life everywhere; whether in republican, monarchical, patriarchal, or tribal communities. It instills good citizenship, good morals, obedience in and to and for the state. On political questions, our Catholic citizens—as those who know them best must admit—are the most independent of all, and even the most divided among themselves.

As for free schools, the Protestant Hallam praises the Catholics of the sixth century for their zeal in founding them and promoting popular education. Catholics have maintained and multiplied such schools ever since, and set them up on this continent long before the Puritans erected their sectarian pay-schools, which were not free. Neither the Church nor its American members are trying to break down the public-school system. They wish to maintain the free schools which they themselves pay for, in which religion is taught; because to them religion is just as much a primary element in life and thought as arithmetic, and even more important than arithmetic or life itself. As to the sharing of public funds for part support of denominational schools, Catholics themselves are not at all agreed.* But even if they were a unit on the plan, there would be nothing

* See statements of twenty-nine archbishops and bishops, *The Independent*, January 11, 1894, only two of whom approved such a plan.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heinous or treasonable in it. "We are not looking to monarchies for instruction," says the L. P. A. I. Very well; then look to the republic of Switzerland, which is some three hundred years older than ours. In Switzerland, children are educated almost wholly in the public schools; but the state itself, in all but one canton, provides for their religious education, either in or out of the schoolhouse. It scrupulously arranges that neither Catholics, Protestants, nor Jews shall be subjected to any religious instruction other than that of their own belief.

The late George Washington, first President of the United States (whom the A. P. A. Orangemen, and the imported patriots of other secret societies seem to have forgotten), emphatically assured us that national morality could not exist without religious principles. The American schools of his day taught those principles. The schools of Switzerland instill them now. Is there, then, anything unpatriotic or unrepublican in the suggestion that our modern public schools in America should teach them, with due regard for the prepossessions of each pupil? Or is our Republic so feeble that it could not endure a sharing of funds with denominational schools, *per capita*, as in England, where the system has neither produced discord nor disloyalty nor disturbed the other public schools, but, on the contrary, has had peaceful and satisfactory results?

At least this question ought to remain open for fair and temperate discussion by all Americans, free from "shot-gun" oratory and threats of intimidation, violence, and ostracism, such as are now made publicly and privately against American Catholics. The A. P. A.-ists are leading the way to the actual slaughter of Catholics, as in 1840–45. They are the Sim Tappertits* of the body politic, apparently aching for a new Lord George Gordon riot. The L. P. A. I., less bloodthirsty, still proposes to fetter the whole people with amendments that will rob future generations of all freedom in the conduct of secular and religious education—chiefly to abridge, just now, the liberty and welfare of Catholic citizens. These people brandish the national ensign at us as though it were something hostile to us Americans. They seem to think that the *stars* of the flag belong to Protestants or agnostics, while Catholics are to receive only the *stripes*. The day will come when the whole people will regret that the Ameri-

* See Dickens's *Barnaby Rudge*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can flag was ever lowered to the disgrace of being used as an emblem of bigotry, shameful narrowness and anti-Christian tyranny.

GEORGE PARSONS LATHROP.

BISHOP DOANE:

IF I put any heading to the reply to Mr. Lathrop's paper on Hostility to Roman Catholics, I should call this paper Friendly Counsel to American Roman Catholics. These are too serious times to deal with so vital a question, either with words and acts that stir up violence, or with words which, by belittling, tend to increase the danger. Looking at any subject of anxiety with a magnifying glass is no worse than looking at it, as Nelson did, with a blind eye against the telescope. And ridiculing the idea of the existence of danger is as unwise as exaggerating its amount. The first motive of Mr. Lathrop's paper commands my sympathy. It is meant to be, and to a degree it is, an appeal to the sound and sober judgment of American citizens of every national descent and of every religious denomination; but it is unfortunately a one-sided and partial appeal. When St. Paul had two contentious women to deal with in Philippi, he was not content with appealing only to one of them, but he said, "I beseech Euodias *and I beseech Syntyche.*" And any all-around dealing with this question of the admixture of religious convictions or feelings with political issues or interests, of the relation between ecclesiastical bodies and the State, must have a word of warning to *all* the people who are concerned. The methods which Mr. Lathrop denounces are most un-American and most unmanly methods, no matter by whom resorted to. Prosecution either *by* or *against* religion is odious in the sight of God and man. Protection against even the appearance of religious interference in public American affairs is a different thing. Every religious body ought to be on guard against it, and every citizen ought to protect the State against it. The language of Mr. Lathrop's paper is not only one-sided, but it is more contemptuous than conciliatory; more the plea of an advocate than the presentation of a judge.

I am most cordially in accord with Mr. Lathrop, in condemning any secret society which is organized to control political affairs. I know nothing whatever about the organization called the American Protective Association, except by rumor. If it un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dertakes to proscribe men from political office, for which they are fit, or to prevent men from obtaining employment, which they could get, on the ground that they are Roman Catholics, I should deprecate and despise its action as strongly as he can. And I need hardly say that I should absolutely condemn the circulation of falsehoods; and *as* absolutely the stirring up of violence, arming against *alarms*, or provoking to violence, by preparation to resist it. But I must protest against the attempt to condemn, on the same grounds, the League for the Protection of American Institutions, of which I have the honor to be a member. That society has no secrets to keep from anybody. It proposes, in open day, to deal by constitutional methods with the principle which it maintains. It has no alliterative alternatives of "ballot and bullet." It is not responsible for the personal opinions of even "its gentlest member." It has no affiliation with the Evangelical Alliance. The *real* purpose is the *avowed* purpose, in its organization, and in all its utterances. And that real purpose is to secure in the Constitution of the United States a fuller statement of the principles* which the Constitution already asserts, namely, the entire separation of Church and State; each equally free from, each equally respecting, the other. And it seeks to insert this amendment in the precise language in which it already exists in several of the State constitutions.

I take it for granted that Mr. Lathrop is a Roman Catholic, because of his statement "that this League consisting of Protestants would join with *us* (that is, with Roman Catholics) in sweetest harmony, *if*," etc. I beg to assure him that he is utterly mistaken in every one of the three purposes which he imports into the object of the League. We have no desire to ask the Roman Church to *abandon* the religious education of parochial schools, but only to *support* the parochial schools in which, greatly to their honor, they give religious education. We have no wish that they should "incidentally" or intentionally "destroy convents." On the contrary, we thoroughly honor the devoted lives of the Sisters of Charity and the Orders of religious teachers. And far from asking them to "abandon the faith transmitted to them from Christ and the Apostles," our only prayer is that they will *return to it*, and maintain that faith as it has been held "always, everywhere, and by all."

* "Congress shall make no law *respecting* an establishment of religion." Art. 1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is no attack on "the very existence of schools in which religion is taught, whether supported by individuals *or the state*, to demand that 'elementary schools' be not '*freed*,' but kept '*free*' from denominational control." This language begs the whole question, by the calm insertion of the words "or the State." The State supports no such school, and our contention is that it has no right to. And the words "elementary schools" are used in a like misleading way. "Elementary school" is the technical term by which what used to be called the "common school" is distinguished from the high school, academy, or college. And these elementary schools are *already free* and, therefore, need not to be "freed from denominational control." Mr. Lathrop's line of reasoning has another still more serious defect in it. Nothing is more unfair or more unfortunate, in argument, than to introduce confusion, by taking it for granted that there are *only* two opinions upon a given subject (both being the extreme opinions), one of which the reasoner proves to be wrong, and then draws the easy conclusion that the other equally extreme opinion is, therefore, right. Intelligent men prefer on the whole something better than this Hobson's choice. It does not follow that because the "American Mechanics," in unpardonable violence, have a "ghost dance" "prophetic of imaginary risings," or because the American Protective Association "circulates bogus encyclicals" and "instructions fraudulently signed" "ordering the Catholics to exterminate non-Catholics last autumn": it does not follow from either of these that, therefore, there is no need to guard against the intrusion of distinctively Roman Catholic influence, as such, into our public affairs; and no danger from the overwhelming numerical weight of the gathered populations in our large cities, of American citizens, recently and often suddenly naturalized, who are to a very large extent under the almost blind control of the Roman Catholic Church. Two wrongs never made a right in the world, and they do not in this case.

Nothing is more impossible and nothing much more idle than to bandy words as to who threw the first stone in a quarrel, who provoked a fight, who began a controversy: and I dismiss the effort to discuss this question; except to say that manliness means self-restraint, alike in the matter of attack or in the method of resisting. But one thing is perfectly plain, in part of this con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tention at any rate, that the so-called common-school system of the United States of America, neither Protestant nor Roman but undenominational, has been founded and maintained in America for nearly a century; and the proposition to change that system in any way comes from Rome. In this question, if there is to be a quarrel, Rome is certainly the attacking party. Free schools, so called, have perhaps been established for years by Roman Catholics; but their freedom is embarrassed by the condition that the children must take their peculiar system of religious teaching in, along with the rest. That certainly cannot be called a free school, for anybody but Roman Catholics, with such a condition imposed. It may not perhaps be known that the so-called Faribault plan of Archbishop Ireland has been for years practised and is to-day tolerated in Poughkeepsie, where theRoman parochial school buildings are owned by the city department of public instruction; while the Roman Catholic Sisters and teachers in those schools are paid by the public money raised for the support of public schools. Mr. Lathrop must pardon plain men who have no subtle gift of second sight, if they are unable to see how even the assertion of twenty-nine bishops in the *Independent* can be made to agree with the text of the Baltimore encyclical on the subject of public as against parochial schools; *or* with various attempts made since then to get parochial schools under state support; *or* with the utterances of Monsignor Satolli; *or* with the oracular yet *somewhat* intelligible decision, on the question between the two parties in the Roman Church on this subject, in the letter of the Pope. Say what one will, Rome does not love the public-school system nor the theory of universal education. The countries where she controls entirely the education of the children are the countries in which the largest percentage of illiteracy prevails. She has a wonderful power of adapting herself to circumstances, with a view to shape and control those circumstances; and she bides her time. But what she wants is Roman Catholic Americans. What we want is American Roman Catholics. And we shall never get these, by supporting her parochial schools or by letting her control our public schools. This is a kind of thing which the non-Roman citizens of America do not believe in, and propose by all lawful and constitutional methods to prevent. Mr. Lathrop naturally sees no objection to it. Indeed, while he denies the intention of Rome to meddle with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

school fund, he asserts that it is perfectly right for her to do it if she can. But it seems impossible for any fair-minded person to deny that, to all intents and purposes, this means supporting a peculiar form of religious teaching, out of the funds raised by taxes from the State. And whether any new amendment to the constitution be inserted or not, this is a plain violation of the spirit and letter of the constitution, which forbids, not *establishing* any religion, but "making any law *respecting* the establishment of religion." We have had a standing contention in the New York Legislature for years upon a similar subject, under the well-known "freedom of worship bill." In the unamended form in which that bill was introduced, it would have compelled the State to pay the salaries of the Roman chaplains of these institutions out of the public funds. It was not passed and it was not signed, until the language was altered so as to make this impossible. Freedom of worship, of course, was granted, as it ought to be, but compulsory support by the State of any particular kind of worship was prevented. I am not as fond of the "*ex uno disce omnes*" principle as Mr. Lathrop seems to be, either in judging of the L. P. A. I. from the views of "its gentlest member," or in considering General Sheridan and Chief Justice Taney types of the Roman Catholic in politics; or in taking Mr. Lathrop as a specimen of the loyalty to American principles of what he is pleased to call (by an exclusion of all other Christians quite as contemptuous as any utterances of the A. P. A.) "the universal Church." Perhaps in his case heredity has overcome environment. Possibly some of his Americanism is due to the two hundred and sixty years' distillation of Yankee blood which courses in his veins. But the fact is that neither individual character, individual utterances, nor individual actions are the test. The question is, What are the pronounced principles and what is the historic record of the great body of people whom the writer of the article represents? And it is not raising a war-cry, nor sounding a useless alarm, to call attention to these two matters.

The contention which I think must be made and maintained is, that the pronounced principles of the Roman Church give the Church the right to control the political action of its members; and that the historic record of the Church for centuries shows that the Church exercises that right. The quotation from Dr.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Byrne's book on the *Catholic Doctrine of Faith and Morals* states the whole case: "We are bound to obey the laws of the state *when* they are not contrary to the law of God." But who is to decide this question? The theory of the higher law, always a most dangerous thing to put in practice, has been the fertile source of anarchy and rebellion, even when it was exercised by individuals, or by citizens banding themselves together as citizens. But when such a decision is possible to be made, not by individuals on their own consciences, nor by citizens of a state formed into a political party or a secular organization, but by an ecclesiastical organization, nay by a single ecclesiastic claiming sovereignty, temporal as well as spiritual, and accepted and recognized as infallible, the case is enormously aggravated. And this is the plain principle of the Church of Rome, according to her own official utterances, of which in regard to this matter of education, for instance, a single one avails against any individual assertion or opinion. I have already quoted it in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. It is from the famous Encyclical of Pius IX. anathematizing in terms "the proposition to instruct youth *apart* from the Catholic faith."

I should like to put here in capital letters one sentence from Mr. Lathrop's article as worthy of imitation of all non-Roman Christians, and expressing exactly my own view of the due relation of that Church to education. "They (that is the Roman Catholics) wish to maintain the free schools which *they themselves pay for*, in which religion is taught, because to them religion is just as much and more the primary element in life and thought as arithmetic, and even more important than arithmetic or life itself." But the side argument of the paper from beginning to end is not for this. It is making the State use the taxes to which all contribute, to maintain and pay for schools in which their form of religion is taught. Denying the intention of Roman Catholics to meddle with public schools, the writer claims the perfect right to do this when it can be done. And I may say, in passing, that the attempt to argue, from the condition of things in England, in favor of dividing funds between public and denominational schools, must be a failure; because the conditions are utterly different. Even in England to-day there is no more burning question than the establishment of an understanding between the two kinds of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

schools, and the decision as to what the amount of religious teaching in the Board schools shall be.

So much for the Roman principle. Now, when one reads into this principle the experience of the past, it becomes even more emphatic. English history, from the days of King John, is full of instances of the exercise of the claim of the Roman Pontiff to interfere in political affairs. The realm of England was under the papal ban for years, because the King would not submit to the control of the Pope. And the reluctant wringing of Magna Charta from the King, in the meadow of Runnymede, was but the precursor of the final uprising of the English people which brought about the Reformation. Not religious liberty only, but civil liberty as well, was the contest and the conquest of that movement. The banishment of the Jesuits from various European countries, and the revolution which destroyed the Christian missions in Japan, cannot be forgotten, as evidence of the attempt, and the result of the attempt, to exercise ecclesiastical control over national politics and civil affairs. Little as there seems likely to be any *successful* effort to bring back such a condition of things in this nineteenth century in America, it is easier and wiser to prevent beginnings than to avoid their results. The wise man will be warned in time, not to attack, but to defend; not to destroy, but to prevent. The principle of Rome is unchanging. The claim of Rome is unmodified. The policy of Rome is simply an adaptation of methods to secure its unmodified claims and its unchanging purpose. And the bishop who wears the triple crown to-day, in the decayed capital of a politically unimportant kingdom, is as unqualified in his assertion of his right to temporal sovereignty and imperial domination and universal control, as when his predecessor was the ecclesiastical head of the Patriarchate which contained the dominant and imperial city of the world.

By all means let the discussion be by "all Americans," and let it be "temperate and fair." Never was fairer or more temperate statement made than by the Roman Catholic editor of the Baltimore *Sun* in regard to the attempt which was undoubtedly proposed (although for some reason unknown to me the proposal was not at that time pushed) to claim, in Maryland, as well as in New York, a share of public moneys for parochial schools. I should be glad to substitute, for Mr. Lathrop's *ex uno disce omnes*, the other Latin formula *O si sic omnes!* Is it beyond

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all hope that both the parties to this controversy may get themselves into that same temper and spirit? The land is surely large enough for Abraham and Lot to live together in. There are points enough, thank God, in common, both in religion and in morals, to make it possible for us to agree lovingly and work together in our agreements; to agree to disagree where disagreement must come in; and to confine ourselves, churchmen *as* churchmen no matter what their name, in the advancement of their own religious interests and work, and citizens *as* citizens, in their own line of civic duties. This is the place where the injunction of the Master best comes in, to "render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." And if this blessed state of things may only be brought about, we may come to what the heading of the chapter in the English Bible calls "the peaceable kingdom of the branch out of the root of Jesse," when "Ephraim shall not envy Judah and Judah shall not vex Ephraim." It is really only an accident of the case that this question assumes the appearance of a rivalry between what are called Protestants and Roman Catholics. It merely means that no other religious body except the Roman Church has made the claim, or ever appears in any corporate capacity, to interfere in questions which concern secular, political, or civic affairs. If I am rightly informed as to the results of the last census, the Roman communion is by no means "one-sixth of the population of America." But whatever its proportion may be, its corporate action becomes serious because it is a compact body, while the other Christian peoples are broken up into various denominations. It wields, in this way, a power which cannot but be infinitely valuable, in its legitimate sphere of religious and moral control over its own people; and infinitely dangerous when it is exercised in matters that lie beyond its sphere. Mr. Lathrop objects to the application of the word "alien." It is eminently unfair, of course, to classify as aliens, meaning thereby un-American, the members of the Roman Catholic communion, *en masse*. They are a part of the bone and sinew of the body politic. That they have been infinitely valuable in the development of this new country, that they were loyal patriots in our civil war, that they have the right to all the liberties of citizenship and to all the honor in their faithful discharge of its duties,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one gladly recognizes. And yet it is hard to find any other word which describes the whole communion of a Church which owns its highest allegiance to a single head, who is a foreigner across the sea. All the more, therefore, is it important that the members of that body should avoid the appearance of introducing foreign methods into domestic affairs. And every now and then something occurs which suggests the maintenance of a separate and unassimilated spirit, and which it is difficult to characterize by any other name. On the last Roman feast of St. Patrick, this old Dutch town of Albany was taken possession of by the Irish, separating themselves as Irishmen, floating an Irish flag, and making a distinction even among the Irish, because it was Roman Catholic Irishmen who painted the town green. It is a curious fact that the next Monday morning, when for the first time after St. Patrick's day, the flag floated from the top of the Capitol of the State, it was torn lengthwise in two; the stars wrapped around the top of the pole, and the stripes floating starless in the wind. If I had any disposition to deal with this subject lightly, as Mr. Lathrop sometimes does, I might perhaps have received an impression, something like that which the New London windstorm produced on the minds of Mr. Lathrop's timid Yankee progenitors; or that distribution might have occurred to me, which Mr. Lathrop suggests, namely, a division of the stripes from the stars. But as it happened, I only felt glad that no foreign flag floated from the central public building of the Empire State, but only the old flag of the one country which declines to allow foreign quarrels to be perpetuated on its soil; or to accept any citizenship that is not assimilated to the American principles of absolute separation between church and state, and that kind of freedom in religious liberty which means liberty from all religious dictation, interference, or control. I am glad to find this expression quoted in an Albany newspaper from an address by Archbishop Ireland:

"Catholics of Irish descent must be on their guard not to harm religion by linking with the church Irish national ideas or customs, or seeking to give a supremacy to Irish control, or so acting in any manner as to induce the belief among Americans that the Catholic Church is not thoroughly American. The Church has suffered from lack of Americanism. One nationalism is and must be supreme in our civil and social matters, and that is American nationalism. On this condition has America admitted foreigners to citizenship. No political segregation of citizens on foreign lines can be allowed. It is wrong to have a so-called Irish-American vote. No one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should vote as an Irishman and seek an office as an Irishman. It is wrong in private life to cultivate the spirit of a foreign nationalism at the expense of American nationalism."

This is a politic utterance of a sound principle. It touches one spot of the danger of alienism in civil affairs. It does not go far enough, I think, in suggesting the dangers of the religious lines, publicly drawn as they have been in Canada, between Roman and Protestant Irishmen. And it seems to me only carrying out the principles of this timely caution to go on to the point which I am arguing, "that no political segregation of citizens on '*ecclesiastical*' lines can be allowed."

WM. CROSWELL DOANE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ENGLAND IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.

BY ADMIRAL P. H. COLOMB, ROYAL NAVY.

To one who has been watching it, the change in the public view of her naval position and policy which has taken place in Great Britain during the last twenty years is surely one of the most remarkable signs of the times. It seems almost impossible to believe that only four and twenty years ago the reduction of British naval force to the lowest possible terms was the favorite plank in the political platform of a popular ministry. But it was so. The government of Mr. Gladstone which came into office in 1869, with Mr. Childers as its instrument at the head of the Admiralty, was cheered to the echo in its design of cutting down naval force to a mere shred, with the sole *per contra* of a reduced budget. The voices that were then raised in protest were feeble and far between; and they were drowned in the roar of applause which welcomed each stroke as it fell upon our ships, upon our men, and upon our officers. Mr. Childers was present, far in the rear, and almost hidden in the crowd, at the great meeting which took place in the city of London towards the close of last year, and one could not avoid speculating on the nature of his thoughts as he listened to the denunciations of his bygone policy by stanch Radicals, and the cheers with which his condemnation was inferentially greeted.

But in those days of the "Know-Nothings" the naval position of Great Britain was the last consideration that entered ministers' heads. It was not one to have germinated there, and the navy, which might have spoken, had neglected the study which could have given it voice, and was either silent or trumpeted with an uncertain sound. It has been common since to say that in 1870 the folds of the Peninsula and Waterloo had wrapped away the meaning and memory of Trafalgar. Men did not rouse them-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves sufficiently to remember that the greatness and beauty of those historical structures were due to the solid naval pillars which supported them. The apathy of the navy is also ingeniously accounted for by the daily life of its officers when afloat. Long sea cruises, and longer stays in remote ports, cut the communications of naturally reflective officers with their fellows, and withered, like a want of rain, the buds of thought. I rather incline to add to these causes of naval failure to realize and enforce the situation the internecine wars that raged in the bosom of the service. Steam was fighting sail; iron and steel were fighting wood; rifled guns were fighting smoothbores; breech-loading was fighting muzzle-loading; the torpedo was rousing itself, and armor-plating was fighting everything. The naval mind was so engaged in watching the contests of these combatants, and in backing, now one and now another, that it had no leisure to look around and to see to what lengths the eager and ignorant politicians might be carried.

But the mischief of 1870 was like a sudden shower-bath to the navy, and recalled it from the fever of internal questionings to the consideration that all might be broken up together by the waves of a public opinion which rolled on without aim or method. After this we may see a gradual revival of the study of naval history from the philosophical side; and out of the study we can see gradually arising rooted convictions on the subject of our naval condition and status. Naval men have been impelled to write and speak because they themselves, on looking back, have reached a knowledge of their former blindness. Their words, flowing from reasoned sources, have gradually made their way. Laymen of all positions have been awakened. Many have searched the naval scriptures daily whether these things were so; and the whole flood of an accumulating knowledge has, in a sense, piled itself in the great works of an American naval officer. We cannot lose sight of the weight Captain Mahan's books have had with the British public. It is not alone the beauty of their style, their admirable lucidity, their logical sequence, and their depth of thought which have givem them power. Great weight belongs to all these elements, but the greatest weight of all is the sense of confirmation from an independent, and certainly impartial, authority, of all that the possibly prejudiced English naval officer has been for twenty years struggling to impress on his countrymen.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For some five and thirty years, until eight or ten years ago, the panic of the English mind was a lost battle with the French —or, it might be, with the Germans—on the Sussex Downs. In 1859 a royal commission sat, which laid it down, amid general approval, and with scarcely a naval voice raised in opposition, that it was not to be expected that England would ever bear the cost of keeping her command of the Channel in war. It was distinctly inferred that the true defence of the British islands was a perfected system of coast defence; and a great group of ships, suitable for no other purpose, was put upon the stocks. "To keep our shores inviolate" by something which was attached to them was the completion of the idea of the patriotic Englishman; and few minds grasped the fact that such an aim would secure their ultimate desecration, just as the aim of the Parisian *enceinte* ended in the march of the Prussians through her streets.

It was not until 1867 that Sir John Colomb, in a remarkable pamphlet, under the title of *The Protection of Our Commerce in War*, scattered all such theories to the winds, and showed that water territory was only different from land territory in degree, not in kind; and that as the only real protection of Paris was the defence of France, so the only real defence of the British islands was the command of the sea. And this was for an identical reason: because neither Paris nor the British islands were self-sustaining. Because the conquering of the communications of Paris with France was the conquest of France and Paris within it; and because the conquest of the sea by the enemy was the conquest of all non-self-contained islands within its boundaries. The growing sense of this very simple position has been now, for several years, working like leaven in the British mind, and we can see it fermenting and developing as the months go on. The Minister in 1870 was content—and the acquiescence of Parliament showed that it also was content—to draw the numerical comparison between the naval forces of France and England, and to assume that the position was a safe one when British naval forces were not inferior. Preparation for the calm reception of such an idea had certainly been made by the Royal Commissioners of 1859, which allowed witnesses to sketch, and accepted their sketches of, hypothetical war positions which now read like the inconsequent arguments of a child. It was gravely laid down that we should be prepared,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in war time, to see an enemy's fleet blockading or attacking Portsmouth or Plymouth, while our own fleet remained fifty or one hundred miles to the westward, "protecting our commerce." When even expert thought was in such a condition, it was no wonder that simple political thought was incapable of observing that a mere equality with the naval forces of France would leave the British Empire at her mercy, because of the impossibility of defending an extensive water territory by merely equal forces against the necessarily unexpected attacks of an enemy whose hands were free.

It was an advance when we saw that we must at least have a naval force considerably superior to that of France; and on such a basis began the era of the counting of noses. It was always the easiest task to count ship against ship in each nation; and when the balance was shown to be against us, a simple and forcible appeal to the public was made. But in reality we might have gone on counting noses till the end of time, and yet have made no advance. It was the appeal to history and the putting of hypothetical cases of war which gradually undermined, and then destroyed, let us hope forever, the theories of the Gladstone-Childers *régime.* Nothing indeed was capable of thinning the density of that block of un-thought but the putting of cases. What amount of property had we *always on the sea?* Scores of millions of pounds. What was the inflow and outflow of our foreign trade? Seven to eight hundred millions of pounds in value, and from ninety to a hundred millions of tons in bulk. How did we stand as shipowners? Half the tonnage of the whole world carried the British flag. Such facts, when pondered over, sank the value of the mere territorial possession of the United Kingdom, and showed that the greatness and power of that which we call "England" was the activity of all the peoples which bowed to the sovereignty of the Queen and Empress. In the check which war might impose upon that activity, the real danger was to be seen; and there could be no doubt but that enemies with heads on their shoulders would never dream of facing the risks of violating the land of thirty-eight millions of people, until they had first succeeded in reducing them to a state of coma.

Then came the question, How much of the import into the British islands was food? And, Was it possible for the islanders to subsist with that supply cut or even seriously checked? Half

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the bulk of the imports—between 11,000,000 and 12,000,000 tons—was food, and it was a supply of nine pounds per day for each family in the kingdom. Counter-propositions were, however, put forward by those who had as yet failed to see that there was no essential difference between land roads and water roads, and that the twenty thousand ships which were required to bring in the food could scarcely pass through the enemy's lines.

Such broad considerations as these were assimilated in the course of time and led to the "Northbrook programme" of 1884. Of course there was here a counting of noses. There always must be this, but it is the deeper sense of our strategical position which led to it, and gave the figures their force. Study went on after the launch of the Northbrook programme, and the views of "the man in the street" grew more and more into accordance with plain fact. The counting of noses became possessed of a graver significance, and in 1888 began the strong movement which led to the Hamilton programme of 1889.

But there was here a most remarkable change. Hitherto whatever might have been the growing sense of reality which was attached to naval affairs, programmes, when they came out, were more based on the question of noses than are the real strategic requirements. Even naval men of reflection and experience were found—and not in small numbers—whose ultimate decision took the form of demanding ship for ship, and two for one of the French Navy. The fallacy of placing the British and the French in identical strategical positions was far from being exploded. The gist of thought which developed into act was similar to that which makes all "temperance" societies "teetotal" societies in the end. As methods of inducing temperance—or moderate use—require thought, consideration, and explanation before adoption, a certain weariness creeps in and the total abstainer, with decision which requires less thought, has it all his own way, so the classes, sizes, and numbers of war ships which the strategist proposes to build presuppose a scheme of strategy; a certain definite course of action on the outbreak of war. But the adoption of such a scheme requires great precedent labor and thought, and long, intricate explanation to follow. The weariness creeps in, and the definite rule which may or may not have thought behind it carries the day.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Hamilton programme, however, a strategical base was plain! Three classes of ships were built. The battleship, as the representative of defence, the imperturbable holder of occupied waters; the cruiser, as the protector of commerce in waters held by the battleships, but liable to be raided by the flying "commerce-destroyer"; and lastly the "anti-torpedo-boat-vessel," specially designed as the in-shore watcher of the enemy's war ports. It was not alone, therefore, the number of ships—though 70 was a substantial addition—laid down in the Hamilton programme which gave repose to the reflective naval mind: it was more the revelation of definite strategical policy at the Admiralty, and the sense that principle, well thought out, was dominating the provision of naval force even as it had dominated a hundred years before. The pause which showed itself as the Hamilton ships approached completion was in part due, no doubt, to mere satiety. But amongst the bulk of naval officers it was deliberate. Silence was for long preserved by them in fear of a possible reaction. There was less cry for shipbuilding, and more for an examination, closer, and ever more close, into our real position in the event of war. But the Hamilton programme, while really resting on deep principles, was not above defending itself by the methods of the total abstainer. Some measure or standard was necessary to appeal to the bulk of a parliament and a people which had perhaps as little inclination as they had leisure to investigate the reasoning upon which the classification in the Hamilton programme was based. Advantage was taken of the *rapprochement* between France and Russia, and the standard set up was that the naval forces of Great Britain should always be kept equal to those of any two other powers. This standard is, of course, as ineffective as that of equality to France was in 1870. If we then supposed a war with France alone, we were—with only equal naval forces—already beaten, for we could not defend ourselves against a foe the whole of whose energies were embarked in attack. If we supposed an alliance between France and Russia against us, we were no better off if we could only equal their combined naval forces. But the parliamentary standard has served its turn. The peg had been advanced one hole, and a table such as the following, when submitted to the public, makes its mark.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RELATIVE STRENGTH OF THE BRITISH, FRENCH, AND RUSSIAN NAVIES BUILT AND BUILDING AT THE CLOSE OF 1893.

	Battleships.	Coast-defence vessels.	Cruisers.	Torpedo-boats destroyers.
British	45	17	130	45
French	34	9	65	13
Russian	15	14	28	9
French and Russian combined	49	23	93	22

In the mere counting of noses, we always find discrepancies, and the above table, which is that published by Lord Hood of Avalon at the end of last year, was amended by Mr. Laird Clowes so as to show 45 French and Russian battleships to 45 British; 51 French and Russian coast-defence ships to 100 British; 101 French and Russian cruisers to 132 British. But evidently the danger or the safety of the British naval position is not involved in niceties. It is either safe or dangerous on broad issues, and the broad issue now raised is the advance which the public view has made since 1888. It is now clearly seen, and as clearly said by men of such high authority as Lord George Hamilton, that in reality the standard of an equal strength to those of France and Russia combined was a mere necessary stop-gap. We must face the real conditions of a war with France and Russia combined against us, and prepare for them. The French are in great strength in the Mediterranean; the Russians in great strength in the Baltic; it cannot be declared for certain that Russian naval strength in the Black Sea may not be joined to the French strength in the great inland sea. Apart from her trade with France, Great Britain has a direct trade with Mediterranean ports of £54,000,000, and she sends £60,000,000 more through the canal. Over one-sixth of her commerce depends on free Mediterranean waters, unless the canal trade can be diverted round the Cape of Good Hope without loss. With German, Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian ports, which must include great traffic within the Baltic, she has a trade of £84,000,000.

Setting aside, therefore, any check upon our general trade which might be inflicted by France in consequence of the position she holds at Brest and in her Channel and Atlantic ports, nearly a third of our total trade hangs upon our power to carry it on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through the Mediterranean and the Baltic seas. Suppose we lost that power, and combined the loss with that which is inevitable from our belligerency with France and Russia : there would be a fall in our foreign commerce from £715,000,000 to £491,000,000.

Clearly the operation of such a check as this, even for a few weeks, might be disastrous to us ; and yet the question is deeper. Supposing we had not the power in the Baltic and the Mediterranean which we so easily held in the Russian war of 1854-6, and were obliged to withdraw from those seas, or either of them : what guarantee could we possibly have that we could close the Straits of Gibraltar, the Sound, and the Belts against the exit of our enemies ? A certain section—not a large one—of naval opinion holds the doctrine, first distinctly put forward by the Royal Commission of 1859, that the exigencies of modern warfare compel the abandonment of the blockade of ports. I suppose that in the United States, after their experience, it must be generally held, as I myself hold, that if there is power to carry it out, the closest blockade ever seen will characterize the next great naval wars. But if the small section of opinion is right, and it is henceforth impossible to blockade—that is, to mask—warships in Cherbourg, Brest, and Toulon, in Cronstadt and Sweaborg, how can it be held possible to close the entrances to the Mediterranean and the Baltic? No doubt Gibraltar gives certain facilities for the blockade of the Mediterranean. But having facilities and executing the task are hardly the same things. Naval forces aspiring to let nothing pass westward out of the Mediterranean that is not followed up, have simply the task before them of guarding a much wider passage than they would have to guard if it were the entrance to any of the ports named. If we suppose the British blockading forces at anchor in Gibraltar Bay, we only see them offering themselves to the most modern form of torpedo attack, and at the same time leaving the waters free for the enemy to rush through on any suitable cloudy night. Otherwise, if we suppose them at sea, we still observe them offering opportunities for evasion, or, at best, for a pitched battle. If these difficulties exist for masking the enemy in the Mediterranean, where we have distinct facilities, what is to be said of the chances at the entrance to the Baltic, where we have none ?

And now, if the masking of the whole bodies of Russian and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

French forces, and warning them off our main trade routes, is not really made easier by our abandonment of the two seas, or either of them, with all our interests therein, where is the gain in such a policy? How can we deliberately contemplate it?

It is comparatively common to hear the opinion expressed in the British Navy that the blowing up of the Suez Canal, and the complete or partial abandonment of the Mediterranean by our naval forces, or at the very least the entire abandonment of the commercial canal route in war, would be a sound policy, and one that would greatly ease the situation. I am quite unable to accept the view, and I do not know what arguments exist to refute the considerations I have put forward above. I can see how much we should lose by ceasing to hold the Mediterranean as the dominant naval force there; how we should lose so many millions of our trade; how we might sacrifice Malta; leave Egypt and India open; facilitate the junction of the Russian Black Sea fleet with that of the French; leave Italy and Austria open to pressure for joining an alliance against us. But I entirely fail to see the *per contra* of advantage. Except, indeed, in one matter which I have never seen alluded to by other writers. If we look at the table of comparative force, we see that France and Russia have twenty-three coast-defence vessels, which are prepared to act within a certain radius of their ports. The British coast-defence ships are not available in the Mediterranean, perhaps not in the Baltic; and it may be equally assumed that French coast-defence ships would not accompany any French fleet sailing from Toulon to pass the Straits; hence it might be said that, in the possible pitched battle off Gibraltar, the British force would be in a better position than it could be within a hundred miles of Toulon. The same might, but yet with less plausibility, be said of a pitched battle in the Skager Rack.

But does not such reasoning only amount to a timorous defence of apathy and idleness? Surely if that is all we can say, the conclusion is to prepare such seagoing forces as may fearlessly show themselves superior to all the forces—seagoing and coast-defence—which France and Russia together can offer in the immediate proximity of their Mediterranean, Atlantic, and Baltic ports.

If we look at the table of comparative force, we see that France and Russia have 23 coast-defence vessels. These are only prepared to act within a limited area round their ports. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British coast-defence vessels are of similar quality, certainly useless for Mediterranean service, and probably so for Baltic service. A battle fought in the vicinity of Gibraltar would not involve the coast-defence vessels on either side. Consequently, the possible force of the French there is not so great as the possible force within fifty miles of Toulon. Hence it might be said that a strategic advantage would be gained by our keeping out of the radius of the action of coast-defence vessels, and limiting thereby the power of enemies to their seagoing fleets. But we can scarcely say that any advantage of this sort could counterbalance the loss of the £224,000,000 of trade mentioned above. It requires close thinking to estimate with any degree of truth what such a loss might mean, but if we recall the terrible calamity of the cotton famine we may get an idea about it.

The cotton famine was a check to the import of a single raw material. It came at a time of great prosperity, when there was great activity in trade and great increase in shipping; when the revenue was rising and taxes were being struck off at the rate of millions a year, which reduction was carried on all through the famine. The check to cotton import was only 9 per cent. in 1861, 62 per cent. in 1862, 52 per cent. in 1863, 35 per cent. in 1864, and 29 per cent. in 1865. This was nothing in the general trade of the country, yet it pauperized a number of persons, rising from 39,000 in 1861 to 301,000 in 1863, and it forced into banishment 365,000.

A matter of £20,000,000 or £30,000,000 of imports was thus disastrous when everything else flourished. The failure of our Baltic and Mediterranean trade consequent on our inability to hold the waters of those seas in war would be from seven to eleven times as great a loss, and would, on the basis of the above figures, pauperize two or three millions of persons and emigrate a like number. Yet must we add that, if there should be failure, as we have the best reason to expect, in confining the enemy to the far side of the Belts and the Straits of Gibraltar, it would be impossible to measure our loss. It was a well-proved axiom in our wars with France that the mercantile flag of a belligerent will not pass through waters which its war flag does not float in without challenge. When we were driven out of the Mediterranean in 1797, but a single British ship cleared for a Mediterranean port. The shrinkage of the Fed-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eral mercantile marine in 1861–64 was only confirmation of a before-established fact. It is impossible to measure the shrinkage of the British mercantile marine in a case such as we are considering.

Before this article sees the light we shall know what the English government proposes to do to meet the case which is here set out. It is plain that there is nothing hypothetical in it, except the chances of war. We have not force enough, or nearly enough, to hold the Mediterranean and the Baltic in such force as would enable our trade to flow there if France and Russia were allied against us. Parliament must accept the risk of war, and the certainty of what will follow it, if it does not insist on the creation of sufficient force to hold the Northern and the Southern seas and the waters connecting them. There is, so far as we can see, no middle course between creating such a force and running all risks. The question before it is to judge whether, in the event of an insufficient naval programme, the temporary convenience of the budget is a due set-off against the possibilities of war and the consequential collapse.

It is from this point of view that the comparative table speaks with strongest voice. If we could send every battleship we could put our hands on to the Mediterranean, to the Baltic, and off the French Atlantic ports, and keep them there—which we certainly could not do—we should have but 45, against 72 battle and coast-defence ships which the allied enemies would certainly have on the spot. Clearly we should not dare the task. We should certainly abandon all idea of entering either the Baltic or the Mediterranean sea; and we should hope—our only hope—that we might fight one or two pitched battles in such situation as, if they precluded the use of our own coast-defence ships, would also forbid the enemy to use his.

Such appears to me the general situation so far as we can set it out within the limits of an article. The effort we shall make to meet the situation is, we may conclude, no product of a vain imagination, stirred by incipient panic, but a simple piece of business determined by the necessities of the case.

P. H. Colomb.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE UNKNOWN LIFE OF CHRIST.*

BY EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

It used to be said, a generation ago, that no German theologian was fairly equipped in his career till he had written a new Life of Christ. Mr. Beecher is on record as saying that he did not think we should improve on the Four Gospels. But, when M. Renan came along and said that he found a fifth Gospel in the hills and valleys of Palestine, and when he compelled millions of people to read the Life of Jesus in his version, who had never read it in any, a new zest was given to the passion for biographies. Every one till now, however, has had to handle the old material. But now Mr. Notovitch comes to the front, and remembers that he has an excellent life of Christ, which he found in a somewhat mythical convent in Thibet some years ago, and which has no connection with any other biography. This is all interesting, before one can take the book in hand, and it seems that the novelty and boldness of the announcement have roused a lively interest in the book on the other side of the ocean.

M. Nicolas Notovitch, who calls himself the editor of the "Unknown Life of Jesus Christ," but who may as well be frankly called the author, has published, it seems, in earlier years, a life of Alexander III. He tells us that after the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78, he passed through the Balkans, crossed the Caucasus, and visited Central Asia, Persia, and India. He travelled without plan; but the curious reader is apt to remember that the Emperor of Russia is interested in the travels of Russian gentlemen in those directions. In times of peace he has to prepare for war. Travelling thus without plan, Mr. Notovitch came to the Punjaub, visited Lahore, and then went to the vale of Cashmere. He

* *La Vie Inconnue de Jesus-Christ.* Par Nicholas Notovitch. Paris: Paul Ollendorf, Editeur, 1894.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continued his journey to Ladak, intending to return to Russia by the Karakoroum and Turkestan caravans.

All this accidental itinerary proves to have a peculiar interest afterwards, when we find that, in the whim of accidental travel, this Russian gentleman of the nineteenth century thus passed over the very same lines which, as he afterwards learned, the Saviour of the World had travelled over in the early years of the Christian era, between A. D. 13 and 26.

Mr. Notovitch, as he journeyed, was in the habit of visiting Buddhist convents. One day an abbot, or "Lama in chief," happened to mention the fact,—which oddly enough had never been mentioned to other travellers,—that at Lassa there are ancient memoirs of the life of Jesus Christ and of the Western nations, —and that some of the great monasteries own copies and translations of these invaluable chronicles. Mr. Notovitch determined, if he could, to obtain a sight of them, perhaps to go as far as Lassa for that purpose. He says the journey to that place is by no means so difficult as we are told. He was not able, however, to go to Lassa. He had visited the convent of Himis, which we do not find on our own calendar of Buddhist ecclesiastical establishments near Leh, the capital of Ladak. There the abbot told him that they had copies of these old rolls, which he had already heard of. Not wishing the authorities to suspect his curiosity on the subject Mr. Notovitch did not press his inquiries. But, a few days after, an accident, fortunate or unfortunate, as the reader may determine, threw him from his horse and broke his leg. He was obliged to seek the hospitality of the convent of Himis again, and, while the broken parts were knitting together he skilfully led conversation round to the old manuscripts. It was as if a Buddhist delegate to the Parliament of Religions had been wounded in watching a Princeton foot-ball match, and Dr. McCosh had received him to his hospitality. What more natural than that Dr. McCosh should give his guest a New Testament? So, naturally, the Buddhist Lama, when he was asked, went to the library and brought "two bound books, of which the large pages were of paper made yellow by time. He then read me the biography of ISSA, and I carefully noted on my travelling memorandum book the version which my interpreter made to me."

Fortunately for the Western reader, this narrative was broken

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into chapters and even verses which precisely resemble those made by Stephanus in the modern Bibles.

On the third day Mr. Notovitch's leg was doing so well that he was enabled to resume his journey, and he passed, not by the Saviour's route this time, but by the English roads through Cashmere and Afghanistan, to Bombay.

The precious narrative he bore—more interesting to Christendom than any conceivable bit of paper could be—rested forgotten in his notebook. But when he returned to Russia he says he consulted Monseigneur Platow, "the celebrated Metropolitan of Kiew." The Metropolitan thought it of great importance. "But why publish it?" As he could prohibit the publication, as censor of the press, M. Notovitch of course refrained. A man does not do what he cannot. At Rome, afterwards, he showed it to a cardinal. He said, "Why, no one will think it important, and you will make a crowd of enemies." Then he offered to buy the notes, but M. Notovitch "naturally refused."

He then came to France and showed them to Jules Simon, who advised that they should be shown to Renan. Renan was interested, and here is a stroke of humor. Renan said he would make a report on them to the Academy. "I foresaw that I should only have the honor of finding the chronicle, while the illustrious author of the *Life of Jesus* would have all the glory of the publication and the commentaries." So Mr. Notovitch waited—and the world waited for the new life of its Saviour—until M. Renan died. Then the field was clear, and last fall we heard rumors of the book, which has now appeared.

The intelligent reader will see that the editor himself does not expect that this introductory narrative can be received as fact. It is the frame of the picture, a story *ben trovato* or not, as the reader may choose. Such as it is, it makes an introduction twice as long as the New Gospel itself, which is followed by a *résumé* and appendix as long.

The curious similarity between the forms of Buddhism and Christianity challenged attention from the time when Vasco da Gama struck India. Earlier than that time, indeed, the Catholic romance of Barlaam and Josaphat had introduced Buddha and his exploits to innocent readers in European monasteries. It was, perhaps, the most popular romance of the Middle Ages before Amadis appeared. The Josaphat was an accidental misnomer for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bodisat—that is, for a manifestation of Buddha. As the Roman Church afterward made him a saint, and as he exists as Saint Josaphat still,* this is a pity. For it would be better to have Saint Buddha frankly on the calendar. The curious reader will find, in the life of Saint Josaphat, in the Latin language of eight centuries ago, almost all the pretty stories of Buddha, with which Sir Edwin Arnold has acquainted our world in the "sweet" poetry of *The Light of Asia.*

When Xavier and his companions found Buddhism regnant in Ceylon, they observed at once the resemblance between its rites and those of the Catholic Church in Europe. To translate their language into that of the end of our century, they said: "All right. We are of your religion, only we know more of it than you do. We are of higher grade." They kept all the Buddhist fasts, and kept more; they wore the "highest" costumes, and "went one or two better," so that the poor native Buddhist priests found themselves quite subordinate. It was in such success that it became necessary to baptize the throngs of converts with fire-engines.

From that time to this, one and another effort has been made to account for such resemblances. According as one believed in "The Light of Asia" or "The Light of Europe," he made one or another explanation. St. Thomas, the apostle, in his first preaching in India, has been made to carry a good deal of ceremonial there, such as St. Thomas never saw. On the other hand, ingenious critics have supposed that Buddha had his followers in Palestine in Christ's time. The fig-tree which the apostle Nathanael sat under has been guessed to imply a reference to the sacred Bodhi tree of Buddha; and the accident that the English call the Bod-tree a fig-tree, which it is not, has helped that view. So it has been suggested that the Saviour cursed Buddhism when he cursed that fig-tree, which, like Buddhism, has such fine leaves and so little fruit.

In this generation, since the East and the West could telegraph to each other, scholars have taken up all this early connection of the Buddhist and Christian churches with new zeal. Cousin, in the first half of the century, had the impudence to say to a class, and to print in his lectures: "At this point I should

* In the Martyrologium, authorized by Sixtus V., November 27 is the saints' day of "the holy saints Barlaam and Josaphat of India, on the borders of Persia, whose wonderful acts Saint John of Damascus has described."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speak of Buddhism. I do not, however, because I know nothing about it."

Schopenhauer * expressed great curiosity about the connection, but does not hazard a guess. Rudolf Seyder has studied it with great care, and if anybody is curious he had better study his volumes. Our own American readers will perhaps remember Mr. Felix Oswald's Cossack attack on both systems, published last year, under the name of *The Secrets of the East*. He dedicated his book to the memory of Bruno, and despatches Buddhism and Christianity together, in his second chapter, in the name of "Buddha and his Galilean successor."

Sublimely and happily indifferent to all the literature to which we have simply alluded, Mr. Notovitch gives us what is meant to be a pure Buddhist view. The date of his rolls is very early. They are supposed to have been brought by caravans from Palestine soon after the death of Jesus, whom they called Issa. We copy the lines most essential to the new history :

". . . In this extreme distress the people remembered their great God. They begged his grace, and asked him to pardon them. And our Father, in his inexhaustible mercy, heard their prayer.

"At this time came the moment which the all-merciful Judge had chosen to incarnate himself in a human being.

"And the Eternal Spirit, who was remaining in a state of complete inaction and supreme beatitude, awoke, and detached himself for an indefinite period from the Eternal Being,

"That by taking a human form he might show the means by which men identify themselves with the Godhead, and come to eternal felicity. . . .

"Soon after, a wonderful child was born in the land of Israel. God himself spoke by the mouth of this child regarding bodily misery and the greatness of the soul.

"The parents of the new-born child were poor people. By their birth they belonged to a family distinguished for piety, who had forgotten their ancient grandeur on the earth as they celebrated the name of the Creator, and thanked him for the suffering with which he had been pleased to try them.

"To make amends to them, that they had not turned from the way of truth, God blessed the first-born of this family. He chose him for his elect, and sent him to lift up those who had fallen into evil, and to cure those who suffered.

"The divine child, to whom they gave the name of ISSA, from his most tender years began to speak of the one indivisible God, and to exhort those who had wandered to repent and purify themselves from the sins of which they had been guilty.

"To hear him, people came from all sides, and they wondered at the

* *Die Welt als Wille*, Vol. 2, p. 716. Cited by Mr. Oswald, who expands it into a conjecture that the Prophet of Nazareth was a Buddhistic emissary, and preached his gospel in the name of Budda Sakya-Muni.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wisdom which proceeded from his childish mouth. All Israel agreed in saying that the Eternal Spirit lived in this child.

"When ISSA had attained the age of thirteen years, the epoch when an Israelite should take his wife,

"The house where his parents earned their living, by carrying on a modest trade, began to be a place of meeting for rich and noble people who wished to have the young ISSA for a son-in-law. So celebrated was he already for his edifying speeches in the name of the Almighty;

"Then ISSA secretly left the parental house, departed from Jerusalem, and with the merchants went towards Sindh,

"That he might obtain perfection in the divine word, and study the laws of the great Buddhas."

[Here a new chapter begins.]

"In the course of his fourteenth year, the young ISSA, blessed of God, came on this side of Sindh, and established himself among the Aryas, in the country beloved of God.

"The name of the wonderful child was renowned through the length of Northern Sindh. When he crossed the country of the Punjaub and Radjipoutan, the devotees of the god Djaine begged him to remain with them.

"But he left the eager worshippers of Djaine, and went to Djagguernat, in the country of Orsis. Here rests the mortal shell of Viassa-Krishna, and here the white priests of Brahma received him joyfully. . . .

"He passed six years at Djagguernat, at Radjigriha, at Benares, and other holy cities. All the world loved him, for Issa lived in peace with the Veises and the Soutras, to whom he taught the holy Scriptures."

[Issa now engages in a controversy with the Brahmins on the subject of caste, and denies the incarnation of Vishnu, Siva, and other gods, adhering to the pure unity of God. The discussion becomes so hot, and his preaching to the lowest caste people is so radical, that the priests and warriors resolve on his death. But he escapes to the country of Gautamides, where he learns the Pali language, and devotes six years to the study of the sacred rolls of the Soutras.]

"Then he quitted Nepal and the Himalaya Mountains, descended into the valley of Radjipoutan, and went toward the West, preaching to various peoples the supreme perfection of man."

[In crossing pagan countries he preaches against idolatry. He comes to the country of the Parsees and shows them the errors of Zoroaster, and forbids them to adore the sun.]

"After having heard him the Magi determine that they would do no harm to him. That night, when all the town was at rest, they led him outside their walls, and abandoned him on the grand routes hoping that he would be the prey of wild beasts."

[He thus comes into Palestine, after an absence of thirteen years. He preaches acceptably to the people of his native coun-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

try who have been suffering greatly. He goes from town to town encouraging the Israelites, and the chief rulers of the towns notify Pilate, the Governor of Jerusalem, that there is such a preacher. Pilate charges the priests and elders to judge him in the Temple. Issa goes to Jerusalem for this inquiry.] He says in the Temple :

"The human race is dying of its want of faith. Clouds and tempests have scattered the flock of men, and they have lost their shepherd."

[On the whole, in the controversy which follows, the Jewish leaders stand on ISSA's side, and they report favorably regarding him to Pilate. Pilate is angry, and sends disguised servants as spies upon ISSA, and finally there is a trial before Pilate, in which ISSA appears. It is in this trial that one fancies that he traces what a conscientious Russian might say in presence of the Emperor of Russia.

At the end of three years of such complications, Pilate gives instructions that a formal accusation shall be made against ISSA. As the result of this accusation the saint is taken from his prison and is made to sit before the Governor, between two robbers who are to be judged at the same time. Pilate, addressing ISSA, says to him :]

"Is it true, O Man, that thou art arousing the people against the authorities, to become King of Israel?"

[ISSA replies that the King of Heaven will suppress all the kings of the nations. The witnesses testify that he has said that all temporal power would disappear before the King of Heaven. The witness, addressing himself to ISSA, says :]

"'Did you not make yourself to be the King of Israel when you said that he who reigns in the heavens had sent you to prepare his people?' And ISSA, having blessed him, said, 'Thou shalt be pardoned, for what thou hast said does not come from thee.' Then addressing himself to the governor:

"'Why humiliate thy dignity, why teach thy servants to live in a lie, since you can condemn the innocent without doing so?'"

[The governor is angry at this and orders that ISSA shall be crucified. He is crucified between the two brigands, and at the end of the day his suffering ceases.]

"He loses consciousness, and the soul of this just one parts from his body to go to be annihilated in the divinity.

"Thus ends the terrestrial existence of the reflection of the eternal spirit under the form of the man who had saved hardened sinners, and borne so many sufferings.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

[Pilate arranges that his friends shall bury him. But three days after, finding that the tomb is surrounded by the worshippers, he removes the body to have it buried elsewhere. So soon as the crowd finds the tomb open and empty, the rumor is circulated that the Supreme Judge has sent his angels to carry away the mortal body of the saint, in which a part of the Divine Spirit had resided.]

"The disciples of Issa then left the land of Israel. The pagans, their kings and their warriors, listened to the preachers, abandoned their absurd beliefs, left their priests and their idols to celebrate the praise of the All-Wise Creator of the universe, the King of Kings, whose heart is filled with infinite pity."

It is impossible not to read Mr. Notovitch's sixth gospel with interest. M. Renan's fifth gospel, so different, will be remembered as one reads. But one is almost sorry as he reads, that if this were to be done at all it has not been better done. It is Russo-French, and almost without a trace of Eastern habit—of that dreamy reverie, which in the East takes the place of thought. One even thinks he catches sometimes a trace of Russian politics, as he reads of the discussions between Issa and Pilate. Speaking artistically, the most ingenious feature of the whole is the resolute omission to recognize our four evangelists. Luke's reference to the Saviour as twelve years old, the name of Pilate, and the three days in the grave, are the only points where the new life definitely resembles or recalls the old ones. This was resolute and ingenious. But the reader amuses himself, as he reads the Western invention, by asking what a Buddhist scholar, if indeed there are such, would have made if he had handled a theme so attractive.

EDWARD E. HALE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANARCHISM AND THE NAPOLEONIC REVIVAL.

BY KARL BLIND.

AMONG the more far-seeing French Republicans a great deal of apprehension has recently arisen through the almost simultaneous appearance of the epidemic disease of anarchism and the revival of the Napoleonic cult. Widely apart as the two movements seem to be in spirit and aim, the one yet serves and unwittingly furthers the other.

As a nation, the French have unfortunately a leaning towards the glorious government of a strong man, especially since the Huguenot element was rooted out from them by sanguinary persecution, and since Paris has nearly sucked all strength from the municipal and provincial life of the country. The old Gallic, or rather Kelt-Iberian, spirit, though occasionally very turbulent, is eminently favorable to the one-man system. The Teutonic or Frankish infusion, which, in Montesquieu's words, brought the principles of self-government "from the forests of Germany," has in course of time become more and more obliterated in France. The result has often been a deplorable one. Noble risings, begun in the name of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, have repeatedly collapsed and slid into Cæsarism. By a violent rebound the arbitrary rule of a usurping Emperor had to be overthrown by a combination of foreign invasion and of a revolutionary upheaval. So it was again in 1870. Yet it is a fact of very serious import that, within the short space of time which has elapsed since then, the Republic was thrice menaced in its existence: First, by a planned military state-stroke (happily revealed in time) of Marshal MacMahon; secondly, by the overweening ambition of Gambetta, in whom the vein of Cæsaristic demagogism was strongly developed, and whose premature death has probably saved France from a great peril; thirdly, by General Boulanger.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Add to this that, since the days of the first great revolution down to those of Louis Philippe and Napoleon III., the democracy of France has shown itself deeply tainted with the hankering after *gloire* and conquest. The natural consequence is that in times of commotion "a sword"—*un sabre*—or a name representing traditions of that kind has always a remarkable chance there. That chance is easily strengthened through an unfavorable feature of the French middle class; namely, its political timidity and want of backbone. Now, taking into account the widespread alarm created by a series of Anarchistic outrages, such national characteristics make for a vague desire to see a commanding personality—a "Saviour of Society"—at the head of affairs.

All this, combined with the hankering after revenge for the defeats of 1870–71, and with the shaking given to the authority of the ruling Republican party through the Panama scandal, in which so many of its prominent men were involved, is apt to confer a peculiar significance upon the recent extraordinary revival of the Bonapartean legend. It is true, no impressive pretender of that name is just now in the field. But remembering how narrowly France escaped, a few years ago, from the designs of General Boulanger—who fortunately proved weak enough to be restrained by female hands, even as Gambetta found his death through a wound received in a love intrigue, it cannot be denied that a danger undoubtedly lurks in the present situation. The danger has been enhanced by the sedulous cultivation of the Russian alliance. Republican sentiments and principles were flung to the winds for the sake of lauding the Czar to the skies. The "Three Presidents," that is, the chief magistrate of the Republic and the heads of the two Houses of Parliament, vied with each other in fulsome eulogies. M. Challemel-Lacour forgot himself so far as to declare, in the name of the Senate, the "homage of France" to the Northern Autocrat. It was an expression not fit to be used by the Speaker of any parliamentary body, let alone a Republican one; for "homage," in a political sense, means the submission of a liege to his sovereign.

Is it to be wondered at, in presence of such manifestations in honor of the archetype of despotism, that the civic and democratic spirit should have become weakened, and that, with the extension of the horrors of Anarchism, a sneaking admiration of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Imperialist Napoleonic splendor should have been fostered anew among a people whose constitutions have, within a century, so often changed with kaleidoscopic rapidity? Pretenders of the Cæsarist kind have always, at least, two strings to their bow: whilst aiming at irresponsible power and cultivating the army, they try to ingratiate themselves with the masses by a pretended care for their material interests as against the middle and upper classes. So did Louis Napoleon during his days of proscription and of imprisonment at the fortress of Ham.

"To Louis Blanc, as a token of esteem and friendship on the part of the author:" These were the words which the captive Pretender wrote on the title-page of his treatise on *The Extinction of Pauperism*, handing it to his visitor, who some years afterwards became a member of the Provisional Government of 1848, and who is famed both as a Socialistic writer and as the historian of the "Ten Years" of Louis Philippe's rule, and of the great revolution. With bitter feelings Louis Blanc showed this to me while in exile, in London. The Bonapartean Pretender went even further. Before starting from London for Paris in 1848, he once more sought an interview with Louis Blanc, who had then already been compelled to seek safety on English soil. And on arriving at the French capital his first idea was, to come into contact with Proudhon, the father of the doctrine of Anarchism, or No-Government!

Proudhon's name and reckless agitation had then become a terror to the French *bourgeoisie*. For that very reason the would-be usurper, who in those days still draped himself in the mantle of democratic phraseology, thought he could make advantageous use of Proudhon for frightening the middle class into submission to a dictatorial government. Nor were the hopes of Louis Bonaparte deceived as to Proudhon's activity. Though disagreeing with the Prince President of the Republic for a time, and thereby incurring imprisonment in 1849, Proudhon, from his very prison, wrote articles damaging the Republican cause. Later on, after the criminal deed of 1851, he even went to the length of issuing a work entitled *The Social Revolution, demonstrated by the Coup d'Etat of December 2.* In it, Proudhon glorified that Napoleonic usurpation. For the sake of utterly misleading his own anarchistic followers, he wound up with the assertion that "the last word of socialism is the no-government system!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In this way, anarchism in France has helped on the cause of a despotism than which there has been nothing viler since the days of the worst Roman Imperators—a despotism under which the country groaned for wellnigh twenty years.

The careful student of contemporary history, who has the personal experience of the last forty-five years before him, cannot but fear that public opinion in France once more exhibits signs of a very unsound growth, and which it would be well for the true friends of the Republican form of government to watch closely. When I look back to the days of Spring, 1848, I vividly recollect from what small germs Napoleonism then sprouted up, with astonishing swiftness, into a upas-tree of oppression. We lived then for a short time in Alsace as exiles from a defeated Republican rising in Germany. I recollect a small print, called *Le Petit Napoléon*, published then at Strasburg in the interest of the Pretender, who resided in London. It was not without reason that he started this journalistic propaganda in the fortified town where, in 1836, he had endeavored to effect a military rising against the Orleans monarchy.

In 1849, when our democratic movement had become victorious in southwestern Germany, and I was at Paris as a member of an embassy, I had many a lively discussion with leading French Republicans as to the character and the aims of the man who had in the mean while become the President of the Republic. To my surprise, they were all imbued with a strange optimism, so far as any danger from a state-stroke was concerned. They wholly underestimated the capability of Louis Bonaparte and his gang. As to the possibility of the success of a *coup d'état*, their remark generally was: "Oh, if ever he dared to do this, his attempt would collapse amidst universal laughter!"

Strange to say, I have found the same optimism amongst French friends of various shades of the Republican party, even among such as had suffered exile or imprisonment in consequence of the deed of December 2, 1851, when, during General Boulanger's earlier career, I entered into correspondence with them, sounding a strong note of warning both in the letters addressed to them and by public writings. It is true, afterwards, when the crisis came and the dark plot was laid bare, the same friends expressed their regret, verbally or in letters I have before me, at having thus misconceived the seriousness of the situation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Out of curiously small beginnings the present revival of the Napoleonic cult has also come up—even as was the case in 1848. At this moment, the stage, literature, the salons, the fashions, and the industrial art of France are full of the Bonapartean tradition. Everywhere the stamp of the Empire is to be met, and the heroic figure of the Corsican conqueror and tyrant forms the central attraction. It is as if Lanfrey, Jules Barni, Taine, and others had written in vain. Yet who could believe that this resurrection of a legend which, after 1870, seemed to be as dead as Julius Cæsar, actually had its origin in the "Black Cat" coffee-house, that resort of a somewhat Bohemian class of artists? It was here that the new enthusiasm for the apparently extinct Napoleonic cult was born, through the theatrical performance of Caran d'Ache's *L'Epopée*, a series of silhouette tableaux, attractive for the crowd, without any dramatic centre, yet apt to allure the motley crew of gaping on-lookers. Wonderful to say, there soon came, as the report of this show spread, a perfect pilgrimage of people of all classes on a visit to the *Café au Chat Noir*. A Paris correspondent gives the following description:

> The first tableau represented the bivouac, where the soldiers were cooking their soup. Suddenly a rolling of thunder, lightning flashes, and a change of scene. The tent of the Emperor appears. The "little man in grey," followed by his spaniel, goes his round, whilst the Grenadier Guard present arms. This idyll ends with the moment of his return. An adjutant arrives and goes to the door of the tent. "Is it thou, Josephine?" Napoleon asks from within. "It is the enemy!" the adjutant reports. "All the better!" is the quiet answer of the Emperor, and forthwith he holds a review of his troops.
>
> Then follows one tableau of a battle upon the other. The sun of Austerlitz is seen, and the Emperor on horseback, surrounded by his staff. The orderlies take his commands; the troops manœuvre in the midst of the smoke of powder; the hussars of the guard charge; the artillery thunders away. The battlefield is covered with corpses. The retreat from Russia casts a dark shadow into this series of pictures, but presently more expanded scenes appear. The Place de la Concorde is filled with a vast multitude eagerly waiting—*le public idolâtre*—the devoutly worshipping public, as the explanation says. Then the *défile* begins. Regiment follows regiment. M. Caran d'Ache had drawn about four thousand figures. Comic intermezzos interrupt the more grandiose and ceremonial parts. The banners of the enemy, captured in battle, are triumphantly shown. Princes, made prisoners, go by in fetters (!); and, at last, Napoleon himself in his gilded coronation carriage. The whole finishes with a resplendent apotheosis, the public crying "*Vive l'Empereur!*"

This rather ridiculous and partly anachronistic play drew im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mensely. Wealthy people eagerly asked M. Caran d'Ache to be allowed to have the show in their drawing-rooms at evening parties, arranged by the hostess for purposes of benevolence, the guests readily paying a hundred francs for a seat. The somewhat infantine trait which occasionally characterizes Parisians in spite of the otherwise rather different aspect and parfum of society in that gay capital, came out very curiously during the rage for the silhouette pictures of the *Café au Chat Noir*.

As an inevitable sequence, the scene of this sudden resurrection of the Bonapartean cult was laid, last Christmas, in the nurseries of France. *The Great Napoleon for the Little Children*, by J. de Marthold & Job, was published with the date of the present year. In that book the *epopée* commences with the young Bonaparte riding a hobby-horse with a lion's head, until at last he rises to heaven surrounded by a halo of light. The Napoleon drawn by Job's pencil for the little ones is certainly, before all, the great conqueror, the victor of the Pyramids, of Marengo and Austerlitz. At the same time he is the loving father, who takes pleasure in driving a goat-drawn carriage with his son, the King of Rome. He offers his snuffbox to his grenadiers. When his old soldiers have taught their dogs even to salute the Emperor, he on his part salutes also these Bonapartist hounds.

The first attempt at the "Black Cat" Coffee-House was followed by M. Martin-Laya's *Napoleon: a National Epopée in three parts, with six acts and fifty Tableaux.* It was given at the Theatre of the Porte Saint Martin, and it has had an immense success, although this spectacular piece, too, only appeals to the instincts of a crowd assembled at a fair. The whole life of Napoleon is represented in that piece down to the inhumation of his body in the Dome of the Invalides. The personages appearing on the stage only speak a few words, after which, in each case, the curtain comes down, and a new scenery delights the eye of the great and little children. Between the acts a magic lantern does its work by casting pictures on a white curtain.

When Waterloo is shown, the Old Guard is, of course, to the fore under Cambronne, to whom, until lately, the famous so-called historical utterance has been attributed, *"La Garde meurt, mais elle ne se rend pas!"* (The Guard dies, but it does not surrender.) Cambronne never uttered that saying. Victor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hugo, in *Les Misérables*, has restored the true text. It is composed of a single word, a monosyllable, which is unfit for printing on account of its downright nastiness. This word, not unfrequently in the mouth of a French trooper, is as far removed as possible from the sublime and pathetic, and few will share the enthusiasm which Victor Hugo, in a fit of strange taste, expresses for it. At Paris, the really historical, though abominable, exclamation is now thundered forth by Cambronne in M. Martin Laya's play, and the audience invariably breaks forth into patriotic ecstacy.

As a matter of fact, I may mention here that General Cambronne not only did not utter the grandiloquent saying usually attributed to him, but that he was also very far from dying rather than to surrender. He had the misfortune to be made a prisoner at Waterloo by a Hanoverian officer and was led over the battle-field in a somewhat undignified manner by his shoulder straps. He lived for years afterwards, and even served under the Restoration; but the legend about what he was alleged to have said, and acted upon at Waterloo, lived with him, and indeed for a great many years afterwards.

These theatrical performances at Paris were succeeded by the publication of Marbot's Memoirs, referring to the First Empire; by M. Arthur Lévy's *Napoléon Intime;* by Masson's *Napoléon et les Femmes;* by Sardou's *Mademoiselle Sans Gêne;* by a cheap *Mémorial de Sainte-Hélene;* sold on the boulevards for a sou, and by quite a series of novellistic *feuilletons* in various papers. It is as if a new political saint had all at once been discovered, and as if every one holding a pen or a brush were in hot haste to profit from his astounding popularity.

In *Napoléon Intime* the figure of the tyrannic conqueror is curiously altered into that of a good-natured citizen, with all the virtues and manners of a well-to-do middle-class man. He is an excellent husband, never failing in his careful regard for his two successive spouses, and never creating any scandal by unlawful connections. On the other hand, Masson's book forms an exact contrast in the Decameron style; so that these various publications offer food for all kinds of taste.

Both these latter books scarcely remind one of the real character of Napoleon, who at the Beresina, when seeing the struggling mass of his own soldiers that had fallen from the bridge into the river, sardonically exclaimed, "*Voyez les crapauds,*" and who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one day said to Prince Metternich: "You are not a soldier, and you do not know what moves a soldier's soul. A man of my kind laughs at the loss of the lives of millions of men."

The performances at the "Chat Noir" café came into vogue at the time when General Boulanger still rode on his black Tunisian charger, followed by Arab horsemen in their picturesque costume, and when revolutionary Paris even had become almost mad with enthusiasm for that theatrical upstart. In those days, Boulanger was once saluted by the publican Salis as "the coming Emperor," amidst the applause of a *turba mobilis* of the most shady character, but which yet professed to be the exponent of real Democracy.

Here I may mention that a friend of Gambetta, when questioned by me, in presence of a number of English members of Parliament, on board the steamer which brought us to Greenwich to a club dinner, literally gave his opinion in this way: "If Gambetta had lived longer, and if he had obtained power as President of the Republic, he would certainly have made himself Emperor." It was an opinion I had held long before; Mr. Crawford, whom I had not personally known until then, fully confirmed it before these political notabilities. He had known Gambetta up to the time of his death, as a friend, and he had certainly no interest in giving him a different character from what he believed to be the truth.

Enough has been said to prove that, such as shifting public opinion is constituted in France, this revival of the Napoleonic cult cannot be looked upon with a light heart, when the deep alarm is taken into account which pervades French society in consequence of the ever-growing anarchistic madness—a madness which has spread even over the minds of such eminent scientific men as Elisée Réclus. In many ways, the situation of to-day reminds us of a similar one in 1848, with this difference only: that the incipient germs of the anarchistic doctrine which already then threatened the Democratic cause have developed since into full bloom. The utmost watchfulness is, therefore, recommendable to all sincere and sensible lovers of progress, lest the Republic should once more suffer harm for many years to come.

KARL BLIND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW WOMAN.

BY OUIDA.

IT CAN scarcely be disputed, I think, that in the English language there are conspicuous at the present moment two words which designate two unmitigated bores: The Workingman and the Woman. The Workingman and the Woman, the New Woman, be it remembered, meet us at every page of literature written in the English tongue; and each is convinced that on its own especial W hangs the future of the world. Both he and she want to have their values artificially raised and rated, and a status given to them by favor in lieu of desert. In an age in which persistent clamor is generally crowned by success they have both obtained considerable attention; is it offensive to say much more of it than either deserves? Your contributor avers that the Cow-Woman and the Scum-Woman, man understands; but that the New Woman is above him. The elegance of these appellatives is not calculated to recommend them to readers of either sex; and as a specimen of style forces one to hint that the New Woman who, we are told, "has been sitting apart in silent contemplation all these years" might in all these years have studied better models of literary composition. We are farther on told "that the dimmest perception that you may be mistaken, will save you from making an ass of yourself." It appears that even this dimmest perception has never dawned upon the New Woman.

We are farther told that "thinking and thinking" in her solitary sphynx-like contemplation she solved the problem and prescribed the remedy (the remedy to a problem!); but what this remedy was we are not told, nor did the New Woman apparently disclose it to the rest of womankind, since she still hears them in "sudden and violent upheaval" like "children unable to articulate whimpering for they know not what." It is sad to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reflect that they might have been "easily satisfied at that time" (at what time ?), "but society stormed at them until what was a little wail became convulsive shrieks"; and we are not told why the New Woman who had "the remedy for the problem," did not immediately produce it. We are not told either in what country or at what epoch this startling upheaval of volcanic womanhood took place in which "man merely made himself a nuisance with his opinions and advice," but apparently did quell this wailing and gnashing of teeth since it would seem that he has managed still to remain more masterful than he ought to be.

We are further informed that women "have allowed him to arrange the whole social system and manage or mismanage it all these ages without ever seriously examining his work with a view to considering whether his abilities and his methods were sufficiently good to qualify him for the task."

There is something deliciously comical in the idea, thus suggested, that man has only been allowed to "manage or mismanage" the world because woman has graciously refrained from preventing his doing so. But the comic side of this pompous and solemn assertion does not for a moment offer itself to the New Woman sitting aloof and aloft in her solitary meditation on the superiority of her sex. For the New Woman there is no such thing as a joke. She has listened without a smile to her enemy's "preachments"; she has "endured poignant misery for his sins," she has "meekly bowed her head" when he called her bad names; and she has never asked for "any proof of the superiority" which could alone have given him a right to use such naughty expressions. The truth has all along been in the possession of woman; but strange and sad perversity of taste ! she has "cared more for man than for truth, and so the whole human race has suffered ! "

"All that is over, however," we are told, and "while on the one hand man has shrunk to his true proportions" she has, all the time of this shrinkage, been herself expanding, and has in a word come to "fancy herself" extremely. So that he has no longer the slightest chance of imposing upon her by his game-cock airs.

Man, "having no conception of himself as imperfect," will find this difficult to understand at first; but the New Woman "knows his weakness," and will "help him with his lesson." "*Man morally is in his infancy.*" There have been times when there was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a doubt as to whether he was to be raised to her level, or woman to be lowered to his, but we "have turned that corner at last and now woman holds out a strong hand to the child-man and insists upon helping him up." The child-man (Bismarck? Herbert Spencer? Edison? Gladstone? Alexander III.? Lord Dufferin? the Duc d'Aumale?) the child-man must have his tottering baby steps guided by the New Woman, and he must be taught to live up to his ideals. To live up to an ideal, whether our own or somebody else's, is a painful process; but man must be made to do it. For, oddly enough, we are assured that despite "all his assumption he does not make the best of himself," which is not wonderful if he be still only in his infancy; and he has the incredible stupidity to be blind to the fact that "woman has self-respect and good sense," and that "she does not in the least intend to sacrifice the privileges she enjoys on the chance of obtaining others."

I have written amongst other *pensées éparses* which will some day see the light, the following reflection:

L'école nouvelle des femmes libres oublée qu'on ne puisse pas a la fait combattre l'homme sur son propre terrain et attendre de lui des politesses, des tendresses et des galanteries. Il ne faut pas aux même moment prendre de l'homme son chaise à l'Université et sa place dans l'omnibus; si on lui arrâche son gagnepain, on ne peut pas exiger qu'il offre aussi sa parapluie.

The whole kernel of the question lies in this. Your contributor says that the New Woman will not surrender her present privileges; *i. e.*, she will still expect the man to stand that she may sit; the man to get wet through that she may use his umbrella. But if she retain these privileges she can only do so by an appeal to his chivalry, *i. e.*, by a confession that she is weaker than he. But she does not want to do this: she wants to get the comforts and concessions due to feebleness, at the same time as she demands the lion's share of power due to superior force alone. It is this overweening and unreasonable grasping at both positions which will end in making her odious to man and in her being probably kicked back roughly by him into the seclusion of a harem.

Before me lies an engraving in an illustrated journal of a woman's meeting; whereat a woman is demanding in the name of her sovereign sex the right to vote at political elections. The speaker is middle-aged and plain of feature; she

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wears an inverted plate on her head tied on with strings under her double-chin ; she has balloon-sleeves, a bodice tight to bursting, a waist of ludicrous dimensions in proportion to her portly person ; she is gesticulating with one hand, of which all the fingers are stuck out in ungraceful defiance of all artistic laws of gesture. Now, why cannot this orator learn to gesticulate and learn to dress, instead of clamoring for a franchise ? She violates in her own person every law, alike of common-sense and artistic fitness, and yet comes forward as a fit and proper person to make laws for others. She is an exact representative of her sex.

Woman, whether new or old, has immense fields of culture untilled, immense areas of influence wholly neglected. She does almost nothing with the resources she possesses, because her whole energy is concentrated on desiring and demanding those she has not. She can write and print anything she chooses ; and she scarcely ever takes the pains to acquire correct grammar or elegance of style before wasting ink and paper. She can paint and model any subjects she chooses, but she imprisons herself in men's *atéliers* to endeavor to steal their technique and their methods, and thus loses any originality she might possess. Her influence on children might be so great that through them she would practically rule the future of the world ; but she delegates her influence to the vile school boards if she be poor, and if she be rich to governesses and tutors ; nor does she in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred ever attempt to educate or control herself into fitness for the personal exercise of such influence. Her precept and example in the treatment of the animal creation might be of infinite use in mitigating the hideous tyranny of humanity over them, but she does little or nothing to this effect; she wears dead birds and the skins of dead creatures ; she hunts the hare and shoots the pheasant, she drives and rides with more brutal recklessness than men ; she watches with delight the struggles of the dying salmon, of the gralloched deer ; she keeps her horses standing in snow and fog for hours with the muscles of their heads and necks tied up in the torture of the bearing rein ; when asked to do anything for a stray dog, a lame horse, a poor man's donkey, she is very sorry, but she has so many claims on her already ; she never attempts by orders to her household, to her *fournisseurs,* to her dependents, to obtain some degree of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mercy in the treatment of sentient creatures and in the methods of their slaughter.

The immense area which lies open to her in private life is almost entirely uncultivated, yet she wants to be admitted into public life. Public life is already overcrowded, verbose, incompetent, fussy, and foolish enough without the addition of her in her sealskin coat with the dead humming bird on her hat. Woman in public life would exaggerate the failings of men, and would not have even their few excellencies. Their legislation would be, as that of men is too often, the offspring of panic or prejudice; and she would not put on the drag of common-sense as man frequently does in public assemblies. There would be little to hope from her humanity, nothing from her liberality; for when she is frightened she is more ferocious than he, and when she has power more merciless.

"Men," says your contributor, "deprived us of all proper education and then jeered at us because we had no knowledge." How far is this based on facts? Could not Lady Jane Grey learn Greek and Latin as she chose? Could not Hypatia lecture? Were George Sand or Mrs. Somerville withheld from study? Could not in every age every woman choose a Corinna or Cordelia as her type? become either Helen or Penelope? If the vast majority have not either the mental or physical gifts to become either, that was Nature's fault, not man's. Aspasia and Adelina Patti were born, not made. In all eras and all climes a woman of great genius or of great beauty has done what she chose; and if the majority of women have led obscure lives, so have the majority of men. The chief part of humanity is insignificant, whether it be male or female. In most people there is very little character indeed, and as little mind. Those who have much never fail to make their marks, be they of which sex they may.

The unfortunate idea that there is no good education without a college curriculum is as injurious as it is erroneous. The college education may have excellencies for men in its *frottement*, its preparation for the world, its rough destruction of personal conceit; but for women it can only be hardening and deforming. If study be delightful to a woman, she will find her way to it as the hart to water brooks. The author of *Aurora Leigh* was not only always at home, but she was an invalid; yet she became

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a fine classic, and found her path to fame. A college curriculum would have done nothing to improve her rich and beautiful mind; it might have done much to debase it.

The perpetual contact of men with other men may be good for them, but the perpetual contact of women with other women is very far from good. The publicity of a college must be odious to a young girl of refined and delicate feeling.

The "Scum-woman" and the "Cow-woman," to quote the elegant phraseology of your contributor, are both of them less of a menace to humankind than the New Woman with her fierce vanity, her undigested knowledge, her over-weening estimate of her own value and her fatal want of all sense of the ridiculous.

When scum comes to the surface it renders a great service to the substance which it leaves behind it; when the cow yields pure nourishment to the young and the suffering, her place is blessed in the realm of nature; but when the New Woman splutters blistering wrath on mankind she is merely odious and baneful.

The error of the New Woman (as of many an old one) lies in speaking of women as the victims of men, and entirely ignoring the frequency with which men are the victims of women. In nine cases out of ten the first to corrupt the youth is the woman. In nine cases out of ten also she becomes corrupt herself because she likes it.

It is all very well to say that prostitutes were at the beginning of their career victims of seduction; but it is not probable and it is not provable. Love of drink and of finery, and a dislike to work, are the more likely motives and origin. It never seems to occur to the accusers of man that women are just as vicious and as lazy as he is in nine cases out of ten, and need no invitation from him to become so.

A worse prostitution than that of the streets, *i. e.*, that of loveless marriages of convenience, are brought about by women, not by men. In such unions the man always gives much more than he gains, and the woman in almost every instance is persuaded or driven into it by women—her mother, her sisters, her acquaintances. It is rarely that the father interferes to bring about such a marriage.

In even what is called a well-assorted marriage, the man is frequently sacrificed to the woman. As I wrote long ago,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Andrea del Sarte's wife has many sisters. Correggio dying of the burden of the family, has many brothers. Men of genius are often dragged to earth by their wives. In our own day a famous statesman is made very ridiculous by his wife; frequently the female influences brought to bear on him render a man of great and original powers and disinterested character, a time-server, a conventionalist, a mere seeker of place. Woman may help man sometimes, but she certainly more often hinders him. Her self-esteem is immense and her self-knowledge very small. I view with dread for the future of the world the power which modern inventions place in the hands of woman. Hitherto her physical weakness has restrained her in a great measure from violent action; but a woman can make a bomb and throw it, can fling vitriol, and fire a repeating revolver as well as any man can. These are precisely the deadly, secret, easily-handled modes of warfare and revenge, which will commend themselves to her ferocious feebleness.

Jules Ruchard has written:

"J'ai professé de l'anatomie pendant des longues années, j'ai passé une bonne partie de ma vie dans les amphithéâtres, mais je n'en ai pas moins éprouvé un sentiment penible en trouvant dans toutes les maisons d'education des squilettes d'animaux et des mannequins anatomiques entre les mains des fillettes."

I suppose this passage will be considered as an effort "to withhold knowledge from women," but it is one which is full of true wisdom and honorable feeling. When you have taken her into the physiological and chemical laboratories, when you have extinguished pity in her, and given weapons to her dormant cruelty which she can use in secret, you will be hoist with your own petard—your pupil will be your tyrant, and then she will meet with the ultimate fate of all tyrants.

In the pages of this REVIEW a physician has lamented the continually increasing unwillingness of women of the world to bear children, and the consequent increase of ill-health, whilst to avoid child-bearing is being continually preached to the working classes by those who call themselves their friends.

The elegant epithet of Cow-woman implies the contempt with which maternity is viewed by the New Woman who thinks it something fine to vote at vestries, and shout at meetings, and lay bare the spines of living animals, and haul the gasping salmon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the river pool, and hustle male students off the benches of amphitheatres.

Modesty is no doubt a thing of education or prejudice, a conventionality artificially stimulated; but it is an exquisite grace, and womanhood without it loses its most subtle charm. Nothing tends so to destroy modesty as the publicity and promiscuity of schools, of hotels, of railway trains and sea voyages. True modesty shrinks from the curious gaze of other women as from the coarser gaze of man.

Men, moreover, are in all except the very lowest classes more careful of their talk before young girls than women are. It is very rarely that a man does not respect real innocence; but women frequently do not. The jest, the allusion, the story which sullies her mind and awakes her inquisitiveness, will much oftener be spoken by women than men. It is not from her brothers, nor her brother's friends, but from her female companions that she will understand what the grosser laugh of those around her suggests. The biological and pathological curricula complete the loveless disflowering of her maiden soul.

Everything which tends to obliterate the contrast of the sexes, like your mixture of boys and girls in your American common schools, tends also to destroy the charm of intercourse, the savor and sweetness of life. Seclusion lends an infinite seduction to the girl, as the rude and bustling publicity of modern life robs woman of her grace. Packed like herrings in a railway carriage, sleeping in odious vicinity to strangers on a shelf, going days and nights without a bath, exchanging decency and privacy for publicity and observation, the women who travel, save those rich enough to still purchase seclusion, are forced to cast aside all refinement and delicacy.

It is said that travel enlarges the mind. There are many minds which can no more be enlarged, by any means whatever, than a nut or a stone. The fool remains a fool, though you carry him or her about over the whole surface of the globe, and it is certain that the promiscuous contact and incessant publicity of travel, which may not hurt the man, do injure the woman.

Neither men nor women of genius are, I repeat, any criterion for the rest of their sex; nay, they belong, as Plato placed them, to a third sex which is above the laws of the multitude. But even whilst they do so they are always the foremost to recognize that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is the difference, not the likeness, of sex which makes the charm of human life. Barry Cornwall wrote long ago:

"As the man beholds the woman,
As the woman sees the man;
Curiously they note each other,
As each other only can.

"Never can the man divest her
Of that mystic charm of sex;
Ever must she, gazing on him,
That same mystic charm annex."

That mystic charm will long endure despite the efforts to destroy it of orators in tight stays and balloon sleeves, who scream from platforms, and the beings so justly abhorred of Mrs. Lynn Lynton, who smoke in public carriages and from the waist upward are indistinguishable from the men they profess to despise.

But every word, whether written or spoken, which urges the woman to antagonism against the man, every word which is written or spoken to try and make of her a hybrid, self-contained, opponent of men, makes a rift in the lute to which the world looks for its sweetest music.

The New Woman reminds me of an agriculturist who, discarding a fine farm of his own, and leaving it to nettles, stones, thistles, and wire-worms, should spend his whole time in demanding neighboring fields which are not his. The New Woman will not even look at the extent of ground indisputably her own, which she leaves unweeded and untilled.

Not to speak of the entire guidance of childhood, which is certainly already chiefly in the hands of woman (and of which her use does not do her much honor), so long as she goes to see one of her own sex dancing in a lion's den, the lions being meanwhile terrorized by a male brute; so long as she wears dead birds as millinery and dead seals as coats; so long as she goes to races, steeplechases, coursing and pigeon matches; so long as she "walks with the guns"; so long as she goes to see an American lashing horses to death in idiotic contest with velocipedes; so long as she courtesies before princes and emperors who reward the winners of distance-rides; so long as she receives physiologists in her drawing-rooms, and trusts to them in her maladies; so long as she invades literature without culture and art without talent; so long as she orders her court-dress in a hurry; so long as she makes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no attempt to interest herself in her servants, in her animals, in the poor slaves of her tradespeople; so long as she shows herself as she does at present without scruple at every brutal and debasing spectacle which is considered fashionable; so long as she understands nothing of the beauty of meditation, of solitude, of Nature; so long as she is utterly incapable of keeping her sons out of the shambles of modern sport, and lifting her daughters above the pestilent miasma of modern society—so long as she does not, can not, or will not either do, or cause to do, any of these things, she has no possible title or capacity to demand the place or the privilege of man.

OUIDA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MAN OF THE MOMENT.

BY SARAH GRAND, AUTHOR OF "THE HEAVENLY TWINS."

MAN is an exceedingly difficult and delicate subject to approach. If a woman have anything to say about him that is not altogether flattering, it is necessary to begin by an emphatic qualification of each assertion separately,—such as that it never did and never could apply to men generally, only to individuals; otherwise the greater number will take it to themselves and be irritated—a curious fact. The dear-old-lady-men of all ages are up in epithets directly if a type is presented without the saving clause, which, in order to prevent heartburning and bitterness, must be as cautiously worded as a legal document.

We do not think of accusing men of supposing that all women are Becky Sharps, but men think it necessary to warn us repeatedly that all men are not Roderick Randoms. When man is put out his sense of humor is suspended, and then he becomes exceedingly amusing. Many a man who read *The Heavenly Twins* would have shot the book if he had a pistol in his hand at the moment. And there is one threatening old gentleman just now who turns purple at his club, shakes his stick at the whole sex through the window, and bawls that "Women had better let men alone!" It has never occurred to this old gentleman that woman would be only too glad to let man alone if he would return the compliment.

When woman ceases to suffer degradation at the hands of man, she will be satisfied, and let him alone. But there will be no peace from now on in the human household until that happy day arrives. We are bound to defend our own sex, especially when we find them suffering injustice, injury, poverty, and disgrace, until men are manly and chivalrous enough to relieve us of the horrid necessity. There is happily nowadays an ever-increasing number of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men on whom we can rely; but there are more who are not to be relied upon in this matter; and if you happen to have the wrong one to deal with, of what avail is it that the right one exists? Laws are not made because we are all criminals. But nevertheless, be careful of the saving clause; and if you are dealing with man's morals, do not be surprised if there are complaints because you have not also mentioned his taste in dress.

The man of the moment, so called because he cannot continue unchanged on into the brighter and the better day which we are approaching, is he against whom woman has a just cause of complaint. If the modern maiden in her transition stage is an interesting person in view of the Woman Question, so also, and for the same reason, is the man of the moment. As a candidate for marriage he is the more interesting of the two perhaps, because he is not so well known. Woman is always being exhibited as maid, wife, widow, and mother-in-law; but man for the most part is taken for granted. If there is anything to be gained by it he puffs himself out, but he comes quietly as a candidate for marriage. Least said, soonest mended. When there is any question of altering the position of women, or educating them better, the dear-old-lady-men of all ages are full of fears. They write reams to prove to each other's satisfaction that motherhood is incompatible with mathematics, and the higher education of women would lead to the physical impoverishment and final extinction of the human race. And, having relieved their minds on the subject, they devote themselves to the establishment of the schoolboard system for the teaching to death of half-starved growing children; and the competitive examination test which is warranted to sap the nerve-power at a critical age of all who go in for it. The brains of the dear-old-lady-men appear to be divided into separate little compartments which have no communication with each other. When they come out from one of these compartments the door shuts with a spring, and then they forget what is in it until they go back again: which convenient arrangement enables them to air the most opposite theories without being conscious of any inconsistency. So we see them in terror one day because some few women are entering the professions and making an income for themselves; this means empty nurseries, they maintain, which is something too disastrous to anticipate. They play in this compartment so long as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the interest lasts, then bang goes the door, another is opened, and they find themselves out of the region of theory into the region of fact; and now what to do with the superfluous population is the difficulty. In the midst of this a cry is heard that the physique of the race is deteriorating. Bang goes the population-difficulty door, and now there is some really beautiful talk about health and virtue. The care of the constitution is a duty which parents owe to their children, therefore women must really be made to order their lives on the most approved method. We have learnt to understand why men bawl at preaching women, and to sympathize with their exasperation when they are preached at, for do they not preach us into preaching in self-defence? We feel ourselves entitled to some little pleasure in life, so we preach back, for the preacher at least enjoys himself. It is a wise provision of nature, however, which sets man talking while woman is putting her own ideas to the test of practical experiment. She does not talk much when she means business; and he does not meddle once she settles him to cackle comfortably over his cigar about her, "don't you know, and all she is fit for, by Jove, I tell you, sir!"

During one of these phases, when the girl is being sermonized to distraction, little or nothing is said about the growing boy: his training in the matter of responsibility towards his possible children, and duty to the nation generally. Nothing used to be expected of him in the way of virtue and self-denial. It is shameful to think how he was neglected and allowed to act on his own worst impulses until the new woman came to correct him. If his education had been carefully planned to make him morally a weak-willed, inconsistent creature, and lower him altogether in our estimation, it could not have succeeded better. And that is what the modern woman complains of when the man of the moment comes as a candidate for marriage. Her ideal of a husband is a man whom she can reverence and respect from end to end of his career, especially in regard to his relations with her own sex.

Philosophers show that the stability of nations depends practically upon ethics. When they do not aspire to be as perfect as they know how to be, they collapse. As a low tone about women is a sign of a degenerated gentleman, so is it also the sign of a decaying nation. The man of the moment does anything but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aspire, and it is the low moral tone which he cultivates that threatens to enervate the race. In fact, were it not for the hard fight women will make to prevent it, there would be small hope of saving us from flickering out like all the older peoples. Woman, however, by being dissatisfied with the inferior moral qualities of her suitors, is coming to the rescue. The unerring sex-instinct informed her that a man's whole system deteriorates for want of moral principle. Feeling was her guide at first. Something about the man repelled her, and she would not have him; that was all. Now she knows. But all along there have been indications which confirmed the conclusions of her senses. One finds wise men in all ages and in many unexpected places holding as an opinion what we now accept as knowledge of the subject. Count von Moltke drew his conclusions with regard to the strength of the French army, not from its numbers, but from its condition morally. When asked, after a visit to France before the Franco-German war, what he thought Germany would have to fear in the event of an encounter with France, he answered contemptuously, "Nothing!" Because there was scarcely an officer in the French army who hadn't an indecent picture of women in his room. And something analogous has been noticed in the British service. The regiments which turn out the finest men, and do the best service on occasion, are those in which a low tone about women is voted bad form. When invitations were being sent out the other day for a great public function, there was a question as to which regiments should be asked in order to secure the best set of officers, and it was found afterwards that in every instance the regiment chosen was distinguished for the chivalrous loyalty of its tone in regard to women. In some regiments there is a by-law still in force forbidding the mention of a lady's name in mess. This is doubtless a survival of the day when a man who spoke disrespectfully of a woman was liable to be called upon to answer for the insult with his life. And, perhaps, considering the kind of conversation rife in clubs and messes of to-day, it would be well to introduce some such regulation, if it were only to save the members from making themselves ridiculous. All the worst gossip comes from these places, the silliest as well as the most slanderous. Take as an instance of both, that story which is just now causing convulsions of laughter amongst women. The ladies of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Pioneer Club have been accused of being so exceedingly fast that men, not otherwise devoid of intelligence, have actually remonstrated with their sisters for belonging to it, and warned their friends not to "allow" their wives to go there. The club consists of women engaged in philanthropic pursuits, moral and religious, among its members being Lady Henry Somerset, Adeline Duchess of Bedford, Viscountess Harberton, Miss Willard, Lady Elizabeth Cust and three of her daughters, Mrs. Wynford Philipps, Mrs. Eva Maclaren, Mrs. Massingberd, President and Foundress, and about four hundred other women, as well known for the most part both in public and private as the Archbishop of Canterbury. This is the riotous crew whom grave and potent seniors have helped to attack, of such peculiar quality has the gentlehood of the clubs come to consist in this centre of civilization. But that it is possible for them either to be so blinded by spite or so evil minded as to have lost the wholesome sense of humor, which would have kept them from making themselves ridiculous, by asserting that there can be anything morally wrong in the conduct of such a collection of women is lamentable. Let us pray for them. There may be moral courage latent among them still; who knows? Physical courage is mere brute force; to make it a manly quality it must have moral courage to complete it. The latter argues intellectual capacity also, without which courage is an edged tool in the clumsy hands of a child. Man's own undisputed assertion used to be sufficient for himself as to the kind of conduct which would make him agreeable to women. It was he who described her as adoring "a regular dog, don't you know." Women had not asked at that time what being "a regular dog" implied. But when they became acquainted with the qualifications and improving details of the career of the creature, and found the most rascally degradation of their own sex involved in his habits, they expressed their opinion of him. "A regular dog" is not at all to the taste of the modern woman, and when he comes upon the stage expecting to find that he has wiped out the misdeeds of a life by facing the enemy for a week, and will be acknowledged as rehabilitated, she laughs at him. He has to face the enemy, of course. War is the dirty work of a nation, and he cannot expect her to do it; but even when he does it well, it is only one of the necessary qualifications that go to the making of man. What

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is he like when not fighting—at home, for instance? Many a man would face a cannon who cannot deny himself a dish at dinner that disagrees with him. The dish is a daily occurrence, and women do well to remember that it is with the unreasonableness which results from it that they have to deal, waging unedifying war with it to guard their children if possible from the evil and misery of an exasperating example, long after the heroism of the cannon exploit is over.

Mere brute courage will not do at the present time. It is not peculiar to either sex. Every woman that marries risks her life, and does not expect a medal for it, either. Physical courage is a physical condition proper to healthy people, and too common to be of any account at this period of our progress without moral courage to dignify it. Without moral courage, there is no such thing as manliness. And nowadays it is difficult to read a paper without wondering where the men are. In this mismanaged world it looks as if we should soon be obliged to do their work as well as our own, or nothing will be done. We are forced forward at a cost of suffering to ourselves which probably only we ourselves can appreciate, because there are not men enough to defend the women of any class. "Where are the gentlemen?" a lady asked on her way through the hall to mount her horse the other morning. "Please, my lady," the footman answered, "the gentlemen are in bed." It was a country house, and only the middle-aged men were ever down at a reasonable hour in the morning. They had twice the stamina as well as twice the wit of the men-of-the-moment kind; and if a lady wanted a companion who would be up and fresh to accompany her, and would not be a bore, it was a middle-aged man she chose.

If "Where are the men?" is asked in the boudoir, the contemptuous answer is, "In mischief—or else in bed," and it sounds like a note of national deterioration. Girls can be busy from morning till night, in doors and out. They attend to their duties and their pleasures, too; work, walk, ride, drive, and dance to-day, and come down as fresh as ever to work, walk, ride, drive, and dance to-morrow without support from any stimulant but their own good spirits, good appetites, and unimpaired digestions. But with regard to the young men, after any extra exertion, it is always the same story: "Please, my lady, the gentlemen are in bed." And not only after extraordinary exertion. In hun-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dreds of households, wherever it is possible, it is the rule. The girls are up and doing in the morning, while the young men, indolent and nerveless, lie long in bed.

Idleness and luxury are making men flabby, and the man at the head of affairs is beginning to ask seriously if a great war might not help them to pull themselves together. It shows the unfitness of his unaided intellect for the office when he has to go back to that clumsy old method for a remedy. He would make certain to clear off the strongest men of the nation in the hope of getting rid of the weakly ones as well—an effectual arrangement on a par with the Chinese principle of roasting the pig by burning down the house. The best thing to cure men of their effeminacy would be to deprive all the idle and luxurious ones of their incomes. Give them the choice of starvation or work; either would answer the purpose.

From the modern girl's point of view, the man of the moment is not of much account. The instinct of natural selection which inclined her first of all to set him aside, for his flabbiness, is strengthened now by her knowledge of his character. She knows him much better than her parents do, and in proportion as she knows him she finds less and less reason to respect him. The girls discuss him with each other and with the younger married women, and out of their discussions is arising a strong distaste for him. "I'm not going to marry a man I can't respect," "I shan't marry unless I find a man of honor with no horrid past," and "Don't offer me the mutilated remains of a man," coupled with the names of Tom Jones and Roderick Random, are the commonest expressions of it. And it is in vain for the man of the moment when he marries to hope to conceal the consequences of the past from his wife by assuming a highly refined objection to "allowing" her to read any book that would open her eyes. The manners of the new woman are perfect. She is never aggressive, never argumentative; but she understands the art of self-defence, and reads what she pleases.

The men with whom a girl is brought up have the habit of respecting her, but it is impossible to be sure of polite consideration from any she does not know, and this sets them both at a disadvantage. The girl dare not be natural for fear of being misunderstood, and, worse still, misrepresented. She can never be sure that the apparently chivalrous gentleman with whom she

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has been talking unguardedly, drawn out by his seemingly sympathetic interest, will not repeat and ridicule every ill-chosen word she has blundered upon in her efforts to express herself. The first principle of honor in social intercourse is never to repeat a private conversation; but this is so little observed one would think it was scarcely known. To the modern girl the man of the moment, when she begins to know his habits of mind, appears as a common creature, of no ideals, deficient in breadth and depth, and only of a boundless assurance. She makes merry over him, and thinks him a subject both for contempt and pity. We are now at the swing of the pendulum in the Woman Question. Ideas are all at extremes. And it is not ideas only that are at extremes. Where woman have been unjustly treated they are inclined to retaliate, as if an eye for an eye ever mended matters! In the nursery the little boy used to have it all his own way. He was the first to be considered, the others were "only little girls." To this tune his life was set at the outset, and he sang it himself to the end. Now, however, the pendulum swings back. In many nurseries Master Bob is no longer allowed to lord it over the little ladies. He must be taught to wait on them, and behave like a gentleman; but, still, equality, the true ideal, is not reached. It is oftenest only the opposite of the old extreme. He is made to do the fetching and carrying and to understand also that he is altogether an inferior sort of person: "Bob's such a brute," "If you don't look after Bob, he'll over-eat himself," "You'll have to thump him if you want to make him understand," and so on from the little girls in a strain that is not good for anybody. Until he goes to school he may be loved as of old, but also ridiculed; and when he grows up the position is unaltered. Women may like him, but they will neither fear nor respect him just because he tells them they must. When he deserves respect, the balance between the sexes will be properly adjusted. He is not yet sufficiently aware of his own imperfections to do much for himself; but women need not be disheartened. Now is the time to cultivate a cheerful frame of mind, and remember that if there is little hope for the present generation, they can spank proper principles into the next in the nursery.

SARAH GRAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

SPANISH THEATRES AND ACTORS.

In no other country is the theatre as popular as in Spain. After the bull-fight, a Spaniard loves the theatre best. A true Spanish home is so dull that men and women alike scarcely ever spend a quiet evening in their inner circle. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that they should prefer to leave their uncomfortable rooms to get warmed and dazzled for a few hours in the glare of a *teatro*. It is there also they see their friends, and continue their habitual *tertulia* or gossip. Even the children love the drama, play, or *sainete*, and on Sunday afternoons and feast days their mammas deck them up in finery and take them to see the latest sensational play. It is curious indeed to watch a box full of baby faces keenly interested and devouring a terrible drama full of harrowing scenes, or laughing at a short play full of wit and piquant jokes. It does not seem at all natural to see children taken to these spectacles, but Spanish children are little old men and women, and a fairy pantomime would be too dull for them.

In Madrid there are almost as many theatres as churches. They are very commodious, splendidly decorated, and all built after the same model. A large stage, a pit full of cozy red velvet *butacas* or stalls where ladies and gentlemen sit together, and round the house the *palcos* or boxes, large and airy, with looking glasses, chairs, and carpets. Above the tiers of boxes is the *paraiso*, paradise or cheap gallery, which derives its name from its vicinity to the sky.

The Madrid Opera House is perhaps smaller than the Grand Opera or Covent Garden, but is by far more convenient. It reminds one of a dainty ladies' boudoir; it is so fresh and bright with its red and gold decorations, its soft electric lights, its velvet carpets and pretty frescoes. The royal box itself is a gem with pink *capetonnee* walls and the arms of Spain above the red and gold curtain. This is only the small royal box, as the Queen never uses the immense one that occupies the centre of the house except on very grand occasions. Behind the Queen's box is a pretty saloon, where she can retire to take refreshments between the acts. There is a telephone there, and it was through it that her Majesty received the news of Montpensier's death one night when the opera was going on.

In Madrid it is the custom for ladies to dress very much for the theatres or opera. They wear bonnets in the stalls, but nothing on their heads in the boxes. The greater part of the public keep chattering the whole time. It is difficult indeed for them to keep their attention fixed on the stage for any length of time, as they go so often to the theatre that they soon know the pieces by heart. However, at the Madrid opera there are a few who do go for the music. Such people always go to the Paraiso. Nothing can be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more select than this "paradise" where musicians, artists, and real lovers of the opera sit on hard benches, and endure the heat, so as to be able to hear the great singers at a reduced price. These *aficionados* or *connoisseurs* have their own way. They hiss the chattering aristocrats. They applaud every good note. They shout "*Fuera!*" when not pleased. It is to the Paraiso the artists sing, and for it they do their best. They tremble at the sight of some faces there high above in the clouds, as they know their real judges sit there.

These people hissed Gayarre when he began to sing, and only applauded him when his silvery voice became perfect. As for Patti she was once treated in a very slighting way by those who now throw flowers at her feet. The Madrileños have their favorites. They love the great orchestra director Manchinelli. They could not do without the comic singer Baldelli. They never tire of Stagno, but they are not over-enthusiastic with any lady singers of the day. When Nevada came to Madrid for the first time, she was loudly applauded. She returned once more, but a girl of seventeen called Pacini had learnt to imitate her so well that she even sang her favorite *Sonnambula* as well as the great American singer. When Nevada reappeared on the Madrid stage, she was so coldly welcomed that a sore throat was most timely invoked as a pretext for her giving up the rest of her engagement.

Nearly all the opera singers in Madrid live in the house of an Italian called Cataldi. It is a cozy old place, with large rooms looking out on the square before the Royal Palace. After the opera, the artists often have splendid suppers together. Many years ago the writer was present at one of those suppers. Tamberlich presided at the long table, and he sang also. His voice was so lovely then! It is a pity he did not retire before he grew old, and had to sing in provincial theatres for his living, because an unfortunate marriage helped to ruin him.

The *Teatro Espanol* is where all the great Spanish classical plays have always been produced. One must be a Spaniard or fully understand the language to be able to appreciate these grand old dramas of Cervantes, Calderon de la Barca, Duque de Rivas, etc. Even the *Juan Tenorio* of the still living aged poet Zarilla is so thoroughly Spanish that foreigners could hardly appreciate it. José Echegarray is the dramatic author of the day in Spain, and his plays are the most popular now in the *Teatro Espanol*. José Echegarray is a civil engineer by profession, but he loves to leave his more active profession to take his pen and in a few weeks can produce a splendid thrilling drama in verse which sends half Madrid wild. His personages are generally of the nineteenth century, and he depicts their vices, passions, and virtues to a degree that keeps you spellbound, as if in a hideous dream. He has one defect. He can only write good parts for men; his heroines are weak and not at all up to the standard of his heroes. Can it be that there are few women in Spain who could act as he would wish them to do? He has written dramas of such fame that even in America and in Germany his *Gran Galeote* was translated. José Echegarray is a rich man now. He is over fifty, with a fine intelligent forehead, keen eyes, and gray mustache. He is a favorite in most salons, but the ladies of Madrid cannot easily surpass in beauty his lovely wife. Looking even younger than her daughter, La Señora de Echegarray is still a splendid woman, with her graceful figure and jet black hair, a true Castilian type of sculptural beauty.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For years and years the *Teatro Espanol* had the same company. The clever energetic actor Vico, always takes the thrilling rôles of Echegarray's old men. The more youthful rôles used to be assigned to Calvo, but, alas! he died when he was in the prime of life. Calvo was a splendid actor, and the Madrileños were terribly sad when they lost him, though his younger brother tries to replace him on the stage. Ricardo and Rafael Calvo were sons of a great actor; and above all things they prized a wreath of laurels thrown to their father years and years ago in the Teatro Español. The writer visited Calvo's home before his death. He was fond of showing visitors his children, of whom he was very proud. Twice a widower, he had five children. His eldest girl was only ten years old and was so clever that she received the same education as her brothers and has won her B. A. degree at the University. Calvo's sister and her husband, a clever Spanish writer, lived with him. Their home was a little detached house in the Castellana drive. The library and sitting-room were furnished and decorated with presents given to the great actor. He had so many gifts that they had even put them on shelves round the rooms. Statues, bronzes, pictures, books, arms, lined the walls and gave the apartment something of the aspect of an exhibition. Calvo was also very fond of birds, and he had a large cage full of rare species, and their singing could be heard from outside. Poor Rafael died in Andalucia of black smallpox, without any of his family near him.

The great actress of the *Teatro Espanol* has also disappeared, but not by death. Elisa Mendoza Tenorio was one of the youngest and best of Spanish actresses, and the Madrileños still hope she will some day appear once more on the stage of their classical theatre. She is not a beauty, but has large black eyes, a white skin, and possesses a splendid figure. She is a perfect lady, and comes of a good stock. She could easily assume the most difficult parts in all the great Spanish dramas, and could play equally well in the rôle of an *ingenue* or that of an old woman. Her one defect was her voice; that often became whining and monotonous. She often seemed to sing her parts instead of speaking them. However, Elisa was a favorite, and she deserved to be one. She was a loving daughter, and her greatest grief was when she lost her mother a year or two ago. Virtue has its reward, and a thriving young doctor loved, wooed, and won her, and now she is a happy wife and mother. Her friends beg Doctor Talosa Latour to allow his young wife to come even for once before the public, but he always refuses, and in their coquettish, bright little home the stage is never mentioned, and Elisa never goes to see a play all the year round.

The favorite Madrid theatre is called *La Comedia*. The owner of the house, Mario, is also the principal actor, and he spares no trouble and no expense in making his theatre attractive. He places on his stage good translations of French plays, or the very best of Spanish origin. He is wonderfully careful of details. He never allows the slightest mistake to be made on the stage, in the scenery, or in the makeup of the actors, etc. If his play is in Goya's time, for instance, the very pictures on the walls are of that epoch, the *cornucopias*, or rare looking-glasses; the quaint old oil lamps light up the scene. The actors warm themselves by the real *brasero* of those days; their dresses seem exact copies of Goya's pictures in the gallery, down to the tiny fans of the belles and the snuffboxes of the uglier sex. One seems to be looking at a lovely tapestry in the Escorial or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the Pardo palace and it is difficult to believe one's self in a theatre. Mario is a perfect gentleman. He takes the most difficult rôles. His old men are splendid with cracked voice, hesitating gait, and trembling hands. He has always stuck to old friends and scarcely ever changes his company. His principal actor is Cepillo, a curious type, tall, ugly, but with a wonderfully fascinating way about him. I never saw a better *Maître de Forges* than Cepillo—so cold and severe, at the same time so loving and noble, the very type after the heart of the French novelist.

Sanchez de Leon is Mario's young man actor. He is a Catalan, and his harsh accent is against him, but he does well enough when he likes. His wife, the Guerrero, is a great favorite, an actress to the backbone, and she enjoys her rôles as much as the public who applaud her. She is very stout, but as active and free in her movements as a young girl. Her cross old women, ugly *duenas*, funny servants, naughty market women, are splendid, and she keeps the public laughing the whole time.

The young lady in Mario's company is the Señorita Martinez, a real beauty and the clubmen keep their glasses on her the whole time. She is a brunette with jet black locks, eyes of a true Spanish woman and a magnificent neck, as white as snow and beautifully shaped.

The last but not least of Mario's company is the comic actor Rossel. He is the funniest actor in the world; even his face makes one smile. He never learns his parts at all, he gets an idea of what he must be and he adds the words himself. He never does the same thing twice over and still he does not put the other actors out. When he and the Guerrero are acting together, they keep the house in a roar. He has so much natural wit and ingenuity that he is invaluable and of course a great favorite.

There are many other good theatres in Madrid such as the coquettish *Princesa*, which belongs to the Queen's late lady in waiting, the Duquesa de Medina de las Torres. The Duchess lets out her theatre, and thus every season the company changes. Another little theatre that the Madrileños love to frequent is *Lara*—such a funny little place, in the old part of the town. Here the real good Spanish *sainetes* or little comedies are played in one act and the public need only take seats for one *sainete* at a time or two. Four are played the same evening, and it is so curious to see a different public each time! It is a capital arrangement and often when a man about town finds it too early to go to his club he dashes off to *Lara* and for one hour enjoys a splendid little farce or play. The actors are always good and as for the pieces they are of the best repertoire. In *Lara* every year there is a new farce that only reproduces the events of the year. They are very well done and you see on the stage the last political crisis; the new government even appears and is splendidly taken off. The latest sensational murder, robbery, is mentioned. The newest inventions are turned into farces, and all this is accompanied with lovely quaint Spanish music written especially for the piece. These tunes are very pretty and soon become popular, and often go over Europe as real Spanish airs.

DULCINEA DEL TOBOSO.

BARGAINS IN PARLIAMENT.

IT would be an easy matter to name off-hand half a dozen or more features about the House of Commons elected in 1892 which will make it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

memorable in English parliamentary history. Some of these are new developments in English political life. They manifested themselves for the first time last session, and marked most distinctly the retrograde movement from statesmanship to politics, or from statecraft to mere electioneering, which is now going on in England. Prominent among these new developments is the system of group pressure and bargains with groups, which came into a strong and lively existence almost as soon as the Liberal Ministry was formed. The working of this new system was exceedingly obvious in the long-drawn-out session of 1893-94, and it seems to be becoming even more obvious in the new session which commenced in March. The upshot of it is that a Liberal Ministry seems no longer to have at its command the arrangement of the legislative programme, or even of the time of Parliament in the sense that a Ministry up to a few years ago was able to secure for its business the time of the House of Commons.

There are half a dozen groups in the Ministerial following, and their leaders practically dictate to the Cabinet what measures shall be submitted to Parliament, and the order in which they shall be proceeded with. This is not statesmanship, as statesmanship has hitherto been understood in England; it is what Lord Salisbury would describe as politics from the whip's point of view; and it would seem that the whip's point of view is the point of view, and the only point of view, of the Cabinet. No one now asserts that the Gladstone Cabinet had any other alternative in 1893 than to make Home Rule the first measure of the session. It had either to do so or to see its majority of thirty-eight turned into a minority at the will of the Irish members. Nor was this pressure from groups eased off with the arrangement of the Ministerial programme, which gave Ireland nearly the whole of the time of the ordinary session of Parliament. There are Welsh and English groups in the Ministerial following, particularly a numerous and compact Welsh group; and as an outcome of the existence of these groups the Government were compelled to bring forward a measure looking to the immediate disestablishment of the English Church in Wales, and also a local veto bill. These measures, in view of the time likely to be occupied by the Home Rule bill, and later on by the Parish Councils bill and the Employers' Liability bill, had not the remotest chance of getting beyond their initial stages. Neither of them went beyond first reading; but their introduction served for a time to ease off pressure from two demanding groups, and to keep their members in an outwardly hopeful mood, and, what was more important, in regular attendance during the wearisome discussions and divisions on the Home Rule bill.

The policy of the Government in regard to the Employers' Liability bill was trimmed and fashioned completely from the whip's point of view, and in response to pressure from groups. The Labor group had supported the Government in its Home Rule policy, and in return for this support the Irish members almost mechanically supported the Government in its policy on the Employers' Liability bill so long as that policy was shaped to the liking of the Labor members. The measure for the amendment of the Employers' Liability law, on which a grand committee and the House of Commons itself spent considerable time last session, was an immense improvement on the Act passed in 1880. Nine important particulars could be cited in which that measure, as it stood when it came back from the Lords to the Commons, was an improvement on the measure of 1880, and all these improvements were in the interest of the wage-earning classes. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

House of Lords, however, introduced a clause under which men in the service of employers who gave them an equivalent to the Act in the form of insurance, could contract themselves outside its provisions. This contracting-out clause, as drawn up by Lord Dudley, provided safeguards for the interests of the men in connection with these alternative insurance schemes. But the Labor leaders desired that there should be an end to any mutual arrangements of this kind; that a workman who was injured should be compelled to call in a lawyer almost as soon as his friends called in a surgeon; and with the whip's point of view in mind the Government accepted the conditions of the Labor group and threw up the bill. An otherwise excellent and liberal measure was thus sacrificed, and the time the two Houses had given to the bill went for naught. But the Government conciliated the Labor group, and have sought to persuade their supporters that they have at the same time greatly strengthened the popular feeling against the House of Lords.

Group-pressure has been applied on all sides at a very early period in the present session. Three instances of it will serve to show how this bargaining for votes in the group is worked. The most daring application of the new system, so far this session, was by the Welsh members. Twenty-eight out of the thirty members from Wales are Radicals. All of these are pledged to disestablishment. It was an intense disappointment to them that, last session, the Suspensory bill did not get beyond first reading. This session they evidently intend that the Government shall manage things better. To this end they met soon after the Queen's Speech had been read, and after Lord Rosebery's speech at the Foreign Office, and passed a remarkable resolution. It sets forth "That this meeting, while fully and thankfully appreciating the Prime Minister's statement of the Government's intentions to introduce a measure for the disestablishment of the Church in Wales, and of their desire to press it to a successful issue, observe that the order in which the Government measures are to be proceeded with is left to the decision of the leader of the House of Commons, and that accordingly the Welsh Liberal members do wait upon Sir William Harcourt on the earliest day convenient to him, for the purpose of representing to him the absolute necessity of preserving for the Welsh Disestablishment bill the second place among the Government measures, and of obtaining his personal assurance that it shall be pushed through the House of Commons during the present session, and that the present session shall not be terminated until this bill, if approved by a majority of the House of Commons, has been read a third time."

In accordance with this extraordinary resolution, passed by a group of members of the House of Commons, which is strong enough to turn out the Government at any time, a deputation waited upon Sir William Harcourt. Shorthand reporters were not in attendance; but, next morning, one of the Liberal papers put it on record that "the outcome of the deputation to Sir William Harcourt has been thought to satisfy the Welsh party in regard to the intentions of the Government. Sir William not merely promised that a Welsh Disestablishment bill shall, if possible, be carried to a third reading, but he expressed a strong opinion that it will be practicable to achieve this." The Welsh members demand another Autumn session, in order that the bill may be carried. "On the subject of an Autumn session," continues the report of the conference, "the Chancellor of the Exchequer was guarded; but what he did say was enough to obviate the threatened diffi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

culties." "Threatened difficulties" is an excellent euphemism. It would have been almost impossible to hit on a better phrase for explaining the troubles in the way of a Parliamentary leader whose majority is now only thirty-five or thirty-six, confronted with the representatives of twenty-eight determined members who are seriously threatening a bolt, if he does not at once, and without equivocation, concede their demands.

The next instance of this group pressure is that of the Labor men and Socialistic Radicals, who demand that the Government shall support the bill for legalizing an eight-hours day for miners. Last year the Government treated the advocates of a legal eight-hours day very much as they did the Welsh members over disestablishment. Practically they carried the Eight-Hours bill over second reading; but although it was a short bill, the committee stage of which might have been taken in two or three days, they so manœuvred that the bill made no further progress. This year the Labor group intend to follow the Welsh members, and insist on a better arrangement. They also waited on the Leader of the House of Commons, almost as soon as Parliament met, to ask whether, in the event of the promoters of the Miners' Eight-Hours bill being successful in the ballot for private members' days, the Government would afford facilities for carrying the bill through committee, and whether, if the friends of the bill were unsuccessful in the ballot, the Government would set apart a day for the consideration of the measure. Sir William Harcourt's reply, it was reported, was satisfactory on both points. The promoters of the bill were successful in the ballot which followed this interview, and the Government will soon have to fulfil their pledges of helping the bill through committee, or they will find themselves sharply in conflict with the Labor group.

The Irish members of both divisions furnish the third instance in the present session of this group pressure upon the Government. Parnellites and anti-Parnellites are all agreed on the need of a bill for reinstating or otherwise relieving the tenants who were defeated in the conflicts waged from 1886 to 1889 in connection with the Plan of Campaign. The plan was utterly antagonistic to all ideas of fair dealing and honesty. In the long run, as was inevitable, it failed on many of the estates on which it was tried. The landlords had right and justice on their side. They were more than a match for the politicians, and, as a consequence of the breakdown of the plan, for several years past the funds of the Irish parties have been heavily drawn upon to maintain the wretched tenants who were beaten in the struggle into which most of them had entered at the instance of the politicians. These tenants have been a source of serious embarrassment to both groups of Nationalists, and, as a result of the pressure they can bring to bear on the Government, in the words of the Queen's Speech to the two Houses of Parliament, "a measure will be submitted to you with a view to a reasonable settlement of a question deeply affecting the well-being of Ireland." The Irish politicians deeply pledged themselves to the campaigners under the Plan; they undertook to see the tenants successfully through with the struggles on which they had entered with the landlords, or to take care of them afterwards, and this is how they are seeking to fulfil their pledges.

None but a Government living a veritable hand-to-mouth existence, and perpetually sorely pressed by group after group, would ever have given even a sympathetic mention of the defeated campaigners in a Speech from the Throne. But when once this game of politics, exclusively from the Govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment Whip's point of view, has been entered upon, it is almost impossible to stop. Pledges have to be renewed, and re-renewed; for, if renewals are not forthcoming and satisfactory, a complete breakdown may occur any day. Even Tammany could get a few points by the study of electioneering politics as they have been practised and developed since the group pressure and the bargain system came into vogue at Westminster eighteen months ago.

EDWARD PORRITT.

KOSSUTH'S PREDICTIONS.

SINCE the days of Benvenuto Cellini no man of superlative talents ever talked more slightingly of his own most popular gifts than the Hungarian patriot whose eloquence made him the marvel of three continents.

"Their deplorable æsthetics tempt them to sacrifice the substance to the form," said he, after his return from a mass meeting of British admirers; "they enjoy my speeches as works of art, and would applaud just as much if I was talking about Japanese fans or a fashionable novel. When Peter the Hermit tried to rouse Europe against the enemies of our faith, they would have complimented him on the elegance of his Latin syntax."

"We are dependent on others more than we think, even for our self-respect," said he on another occasion; "or I would gladly dispense with this sort of popularity. It might subserve my private ambition, but does not seem to promote the interest of our cause."

Our great Florentine sculptor pleased himself in the rôle of a military fire-eater, and Louis Kossuth would have exchanged all the laurels of Demosthenes for the honors of a political prophet. As early as 1844 he urged his countrymen to leave the House of Hapsburg as they would flee from a fallen temple, and to the last day of his life he maintained that the predicted catastrophe had been postponed, rather than prevented, by artificial props, which would only add to the weight of the final collapse. Conflicting interests, he held, would dissolve the work of mediæval empire builders as they had cancelled the conquests of the Cæsars, and would one day divorce the emancipated masses from every dynasty of the civilized world. "After the hood of ignorance is once removed from the eyes of a nation," he said, "all other fetters will drop in quick succession; only we should remember that the decisive circumstance in such matters is the level of general intelligence—not the eminence of isolated scholars. A few of your North European savants, no doubt, tower head and shoulders above Rousseau and Voltaire, but the mental emancipation of the average French citizen at the end of the eighteenth century has never been paralleled outside of North America: hence the phenomenon of a Republican revolt preceding that of other European nations by more than a hundred years. Hence, also, the miraculous victories of the first Napoleon, whose army held the trump cards in brains as well as in courage and national enthusiasm."

"For our so-called civilized monarchies," he adds, "the control of public schools has become an affair of self-preservation; still the sunrise of reason will proceed faster than they expect, because the ability to read implies all sorts of things, nowadays, and calamity, too, is apt to operate as a sudden eye-opener." Kossuth seems to have expected a great European war as a prelude to a general insurrection, followed by a confederation of Old World republics, on the model of the United States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The rise of that revolt," he says, "will proceed from west to east, and the rulers of far-eastern autocracies will then suddenly become liberal and benign, but they will have to make their reckoning with the laws of moral contagion. The example set by the prosperity of neighboring freedmen will make the most indolent nation rebel against the mildest of monarchs, *vide* the case of D. P." (Dom Pedro?) "and of the Spanish West Indies."

"Redeemable Europe" (*das rettbare Europa*) is a term that often occurs in Kossuth's political pamphlets, and seems to imply a distinction between the progressive and effete, or even retrogressive nations of the Caucasian continent. Among the first-named class the Magyar patriot emphatically ranks his native land, as well as Bulgaria, Roumania, and Servia —countries which identity of interest will unite in a "Danubian Federation," while some of the Mediterranean peninsula will follow Asia Minor into the limbo of worn-out lands.

The bitter mementos of Vilagos did not prevent Kossuth from auguring a great future for the Russian Empire,—"a colossus," he says, "which for centuries has been kept in a state of moral hibernation, from which it will one day rouse itself, hungry, fierce, and decidedly wide-awake."

Nihilism, however, he repudiated so emphatically that he often declared his inability to imagine the process by which a sane human being could get himself to expect any salutary results from experiments of that sort: "Anarchy is a correlation of disorganization, and we might as well try to remedy a toothache with a dose of dynamite."

Nor was his faith in Socialism much stronger, but he admits the probability that it will be practically tested not only with great persistence, but on a very large scale. "The real tendencies of the system," he predicts, "will then reveal themselves in a manner not apt to be forgotten by the next few generations of Utopia-hunters."

The twentieth century, withal, "will be an era of strange experiments, in religion as well as in social and educational reform." In commenting upon the monstrous aberration of the Skopzis he remarks: "There was a time when I had begun to hope that the age of moral epidemics was gone by forever, but the capacity of the Slavonic races for obstinate fanaticism is a fact, ominous enough to make a candid observer somewhat thoughtful. If such doctrines are persecution proof, it is worse than useless to attempt the suppression of comparatively plausible creeds, like Mormonism and the gospel of the Wahabees."

"Have you ever been in Albania?" Kossuth asked a French traveller, who visited him in his Turkish exile. "A good many years before the birth of Napoleon, Jean Jacques Rousseau recorded a presentiment that 'the island of Corsica would some day produce a man destined to astonish the world,' and I have a similar presentiment in regard to the Albanian highlands. The natives of those out-of-the-way mountains have thus far had no chance to appear on the stage of great historical events, and have preserved their primitive energy, together with a terrible strength of passion and a heroic tenacity of purpose."

In 1850 the Turks saved Kossuth's life by refusing to surrender him to the victors of Vilagos, and that proof of generosity may have helped to modify his horoscope of their political prospects. "The race of the old Turkoman shepherds," he says, "could hardly have stood their ground on this side of the Dardanelles, but that in the veins of their ruling classes there is by this time quite as much Circassian blood as there is an alloy of Norman

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enterprise in the constitution of the conservative Anglo-Saxon, and that inheritance will be sure to tell in the coming life-and-death struggle against the power of the encroaching Muscovites."

His second ally, the victorious army of the North German Empire, was the subject of his frequent encomiums, but he scouted the idea that its conquests could ever enforce a permanent peace on the Rhine. "France," he said, "may be stunned by a knockdown blow, but enduring acquiescence is not in the nature of the Gallic race. The descendants of the restless Gauls run no risk from dry-rot. They will perish fighting."

"Keep your eye on Chile," he once advised an American visitor; "there, if anywhere, the lost prestige of the Spanish race will reassert itself under the auspices of favorable political and climatic conditions. Modern civilization is a plant that will not thrive under the equator."

"Don't you think that the name of the *United* States will eventually become a misnomer?" asked the same interviewer.

"Likely enough," said Kossuth, "but what does it matter? That will not change the fact that North America is destined to be a land of prosperous republics. America, in many important senses of the word, is the land of the future. Its geographical facilities for experiment and the Yankee ingenuity of its master-race will solve all sorts of social problems—the *Crux Reformatorum*, perpetual peace, perhaps, alone excepted."

"So you think war will continue to the end of time?"

"Yes, at least just as long as force remains the only imaginable way to suppress a revolt against the decisions of the proposed Court of International Arbitration. The dawn of the millennium may change human nature, but all we can do in the mean time is to perfect the engines of destruction in a manner that will make warlike nations hesitate to incur the responsibility for a breach of the peace. The appearance of a redoubtable strategist keeps the world quiet for a while, and the invention of an irresistible engine of war may have the same effect—till the self-reliance of our cautious neighbors is revived by a still more ingenious invention of their own. In America, especially, 'wondrous engines' will be shooting as well as spinning, but that is not going to prevent an enormous increase of population, and a development of cities the like of which the world has never seen. If it were not for my fits of asthma, I would be content, like Fenelon, to live on, *par pure curiosité*, to witness the more and more miraculous achievements of this age of inventions."

Kossuth's recovery from many apparently hopeless disorders may really have had something to do with the intensity of his personal interest in all the important events of his time. As his library attests, the range of his studies was as wide as the field of science; but the history of reform remained his hobby, and to the last day of his long life the calm preceding the outbreak of a general European storm did not for a moment make him doubt the correctness of his political forecast.

Only six months ago he sent his friend, Signor Mantegazza, of Rome, a journal of the Society for Asiatic Researches, with an account of an episode in the mediæval history of China, and a marginal note: "Is not this tradition a prototype of many a prophet's fate?"

The text of that comment was as follows: In the reign of the Emperor Hiong Wang, two astronomers, Hoy and Yun-Tsi, predicted an eclipse of the sun, and were sentenced to death for blasphemy. The Emperor had a personal interview with the star-gazers and was inclined to commute their sen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tence, but at the suggestion of a learned mandarin, and at their own request, he remanded them to prison to await the outcome of their prophecy. If their prediction should be justified by the event they were to be dismissed with honors and rich presents; otherwise they were to be beheaded as blasphemous impostors. At the appointed time the people of Nankin crowded their housetops, and all eyes were riveted on the sky, but the sun shone all day with undimmed splendor, and at night the Emperor consented to let the law take its course. The sentence of death was accordingly executed; but the very next morning, when the mandarins assembled to burn the books of the blasphemers, the ceremony was interrupted by a total eclipse of the sun.

F. L. OSWALD.

NATIONAL BANK EXAMINERS CRITICISED.

THE Honorable E. S. Lacey, when Comptroller of the Currency, suggested that a training-school of bank examiners, as an adjunct to the administration of the Banking Department of the general Government, should be established, believing that the provisions of the National Bank Act would, through the thorough training of bank examiners, be much better enforced.

Just how such a school could be established, without great expense to the Government, and what plan could be pursued to give bank examiners, besides technical drill, also a requisite business training, he did not perhaps suggest; yet the suggestion seems to be a fruitful idea, for any one who has had experience with bank examination, as it was actually carried on, up to a very recent period at least, knows that much bank examination was farcical in the extreme. Many of the old-time examiners were inexperienced in banking or any other business: sometimes broken-down bankers of dissipated habits, or, frequently again, relatives of prominent politicians or statesmen, or, what was worse in some respects, men who were politicians and by political influence obtained the important post of bank examiner as reward for work done for the party in power.

Instances are known where examiners became too drunk while making an examination to complete it, and by a skilful manipulation of documents the real condition of the bank was not reported to the Bank Department at Washington. It is not said that the public were likely to be injured in all cases by such neglect, but the tendency was bad, as it encouraged loose methods in bank management and avoided the corrective hand of the Comptroller. No one but an experienced banker can fully appreciate the effect the criticisms and strictures have upon bank officers from the Bank Department.

Then, again, there were other instances where rival banks, by a too liberally dispensed hospitality to a too susceptible examiner, rendered him mellow, and then plied him with questions concerning opposition banks, or put questions in his mouth to be asked of rivals that Socrates himself would never have thought of.

There were still other cases where a bank examiner was known to make a temporary loan from the bank undergoing examination, but which he forgot to pay. It is quite needless to say that the report of the bank so victimized was favorable.

This condition of things was more common some ten or fifteen years after the National Bank system was established, and in the rural districts

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and in the West, than in more recent years, or in the great cities, or in the Eastern portion of the country. Actual observation taught these views; and notwithstanding the office of bank examiner is still made a perquisite in most instances by the party in power, it is presumed that bank examiners have improved somewhat in character and, it is hoped, in secrecy; but they have not improved enough in experience and technical training.

While it is true that an examiner cannot tell anything about the particular character of bills receivable or the standing of the makers, yet an examination will have a good effect if an examiner can detect when too much paper is signed by one name, or if paper is more than six months overdue. The novice can judge of these points, but he cannot tell if paper appears right in general, nor can he detect a "kite." It is in forming a general idea of bank management that the inexperienced examiner fails most signally. Then, again, the old-time bank examiners were not exact in their additions, and were not particular to see that results corresponded with the totals shown by the books. Now, looseness or inexactness in these points seems to be a quite small matter, but they have a marked effect on bank officers, as I have occasion to know.

Even from the few points given it still seems reasonable to think that bank examiners should have far more experience than is usual; that it is important that they should be men of the highest character, integrity, and temperance, and above all fearlessness in the performance of their duties. But such men cannot be procured in many of the cases under existing methods, and if there is a branch of the public service that should be put under civil-service rules this is the one. It is evident that politicians in rewarding their henchmen are not going to be over-nice in selecting men for the very important post of bank examiner, if they can get rid of an importunate office-seeker or reward a striker by giving him this post. Politics should have no place in banking. A banker, like a preacher, ought not to meddle with politics or religion. But it is far more important that a bank examiner should not be a politician nor be dependent upon political influence for the position.

The public has plenty of evidence of the incompetency and dishonesty of bank examiners in the disastrous results to depositors and business. It seems quite needless to insist upon the reasonableness of appointing bank examiners upon some system founded upon merit and capacity. Better examinations would follow such a plan, with better results and fewer failures. Another defect of the present system is excess of territory. This excess gives the individual examiner too many miles to travel and too short time for the examination of each bank, as he is expected to go over his territory once a year. Many examiners were known to examine a large bank in a few hours, upon which they should have spent as many days. Human nature in a bank examiner is much the same as in men in other walks of life, and they will try to earn as large daily wages as possible; for banks are assessed so much according to capital, and not upon amount of business done, or the actual work that the examiner has to perform.

Bank examination is one of the best devices of governmental supervision of modern banking, but it is yet in its infancy and is capable of much greater development and efficiency; so by all means place bank examiners under civil-service rules, and if nothing better can be done, put them in a training-school at Government expense.

J. M. GRAYBILL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE VALUE OF DIALECT.

ALL art is fidelity to pure and idealized Nature. The true artist is her interpreter and confidante. She admits him alone to her studio and reveals there her most perfect creations. Thus he who aspires to write must, as it were, be in the secret with Nature; otherwise she repudiates his work. The divine fire of expression can be kindled only by a spark from her own altar. But her phases of beauty and grandeur, humor and tenderness, are myriad fold and ever changing, so that he who would preserve them must catch them flitting by exactly as he perceives them. It is the individual, not the mass, that attracts our closest attention and claims our sympathetic interest. We cannot, however, differentiate this individual from his manner of thought, nor the thought from the medium of expression. Thus, by Nature's own law, the use of dialect is often a necessity.

Story-writing is an attempt to preserve the life of a certain time and locality with all the concomitants of local coloring. The personal experience of the writer becomes thus all-important, as it should; he can testify with authority only of what he knows. On this principle Miss Murfree could not have delineated the old New England life, nor could Miss Wilkins have pictured for us the Tennessee mountaineers.

I seriously doubt if certain types of character can be adequately depicted with dialect. Mental traits are often inseparably wedded to the linguistic medium. Take for illustration this description of the "rebel yell" by the old negro in Page's *Meh Lady:* "You'd a thought de wull wuz splittin' open, an' sometimes ef you'd listen right good you could heah 'em yellin', like folks in de harves'-fiel' hollerin' after a ole hyah." If we attempt to paraphrase this into good English, much of the pecular sentiment is lost in the process. The subtle aroma, which is its charm, evaporates.

In a recent letter to the writer Mr. Page makes this remark: "It has been very often suggested that I was writing up the darkie; but my real intention has always been to write up the South and its social life, using the darkie as the medium to tell the story, because he was a constituent part of that life." Some critics hold that it is more difficult to write a perfect dialect story than one in classic English. The art is higher, they say, being more complex. The vigorous, native vernacular has a delightful flavor, for it is in perfect harmony with the people's life. The language of the average unconventional man is quite satisfactory, especially in a book. As soon as he is made "to talk proper" he is spoiled. I think that we would hardly have formed the acquaintance of the old Virginia "uncle" or the Western "hoosier," or the pretty Creoles if they had been made to talk to us in Hawthornesque English!

Ours is such a heterogeneous country, to be true to the life of all sections, our romancers must use a score or two of dialects. Dialects are but the pigments which are used in producing lifelike pictures of the people. All stories are only so many separate sketches of the many-sided social structure of American life. A great national novel in this country is almost an impossibility. Such a work must portray with skilful hand and sympathetic touch the many types of American character; and these must not be labeled, but it should be possible to tell from what section each comes, by his dialect. On this account it seems likely that the fiction of the future will continue to take the form of the short story or character sketch.

ARMSTRONG WAUCHOPE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED